The QUARTERLY JOURNAL *of* SPEECH

VOLUME 35 • DECEMBER 1949 • NUMBER 4

A SYMPOSIUM ON RHETORIC AND GENERAL EDUCATION

Since the article by Dean Everett L. Hunt appearing in the October issue was of interest to students of general education as well as speech, we submitted it to a number of educational leaders for their comment. We publish below some of the replies received. Two are from college presidents; two are from members of the committee which drew up the Harvard Report on General Education in a Free Society; *and the others are by persons concerned with problems of general education.*

More specifically, PAUL KLAPPER *is president of Queens College and a visiting professor at the University of Chicago in 1949-50.* PAUL R. ANDERSON *is President of Pennsylvania College for Women.* LLOYD C. EMMONS *is Dean of the College of Science and Arts at Michigan State College.* HOWARD MUMFORD JONES *is professor of English and former dean of the Graduate School at Harvard University.* RAPHAEL DEMOS *is professor of philosophy at Harvard.* I. A. RICHARDS *is a professor in the Graduate School of Education at Harvard and author of* The Philosophy of Rhetoric *and* Interpretation in Teaching. B. L. ULLMAN *is professor of classics at the University of North Carolina.* NORMAN FOERSTER *is professor of English at Duke University.* HAROLD B. DUNKEL *is the University Examiner of the University of Chicago.* EVERETT L. HUNT, *who makes the final reply, is professor of English and dean of Swarthmore College.* EDITOR.

Thank you for letting me see Dean Everett Hunt's interesting paper, Rhetoric and General Education. One does not frequently meet a specialist who looks upon his subject as an instrument for educating young people of promise rather than as a means of making more specialists in his own image.

General education is beginning to mean all things to all people. The Harvard Report makes a strong plea for a 'common understanding of the heritage which is the possession' of one's generation (p. 192). But, there is no justification in the Report for Dean Hunt's extravagant inference, 'We have then, a new background, for our demand for the good man skilled in speaking. Again, the whole curriculum is pointed towards this end.' Dean Hunt quotes the Report as defining the good man as 'one who possesses an inner integration, poise and firmness which come from an adequate philosophy of life' (p. 74). There is nothing here which argues that 'the whole curriculum is pointed towards' the good man skilled in speaking.

Nor can one accept Dean Hunt's conditional clause in the statement that Charles Eliot believed that one 'might be ignorant of any particular field of knowledge and still be thought cultivated, if only he could use his mother tongue with distinction.' The reader is left with the impression that by Eliot's appraisal, 'The good man skilled in speaking was still the final test and the unifying influence in the elective system.' The adoration of rhetoric sapped the vitality of more than one system of education in Pagan as well as in Christian cultures.

Dean Hunt fails to indicate the substance and the design of the rhetoric he

would teach to make good men skilled in speaking. Nor does he tell us whether good men would be selected to be made skilled speakers by rhetoric or whether the benevolent influence of rhetoric would make of our students not only good men but also skilled speakers. Dean Hunt makes no effort to explain the meaning of *good* and *skilled*. One may be a good man, a participating and enriching citizen and yet, an unskilled speaker. Aristotle observed that a good citizen is not necessarily a good man because so much depends on the government in whose behalf he exercises his skills as a citizen.

General education, whatever its specific connotation, must not be made the academic umbrella which shelters all the waifs of higher education. The basic aim of a program of general education is to develop a liberal mind which is hospitable to the new as well as to the old, to social change as well as to preservation of our social heritage. To the extent to which general studies approximate this end do they serve the needs of a free people, and their democratic design of living.

PAUL KLAPPER,
Queens College

I have read with great interest Everett Hunt's article on Rhetoric and General Education in the October issue. His contention that the development of curricula in general education offers a rich opportunity for the recovery of speech as a dynamic subject is sound. Observation leads me to believe that speech departments have been prepared and anxious to dovetail their efforts with an all-college program. The trouble is that there has been no orderly curriculum with which speech work could be dovetailed. Compartmentalization has been the rule—and speech departments have been forced by circumstance to develop their own form of specialization. Let's hope this day is gone forever.

Assuming that institutions do have a program of general education (and this is by no means common as yet), then the question remains as to what the emphasis in speech shall be. Our own resolution of the problem at Pennsylvania College for Women has been to conceive of speech functionally. We regard it essentially as the communication of ideas. The problem then becomes one of having a natural and ready source of ideas. We have found a required course in Modern Society to be such a source. The material is contemporary, the issues are in many cases pressing, and there is room for controversy. Speech and social studies faculty coordinate their efforts to a surprising degree. Students take both courses concurrently and they have materials with which they are (or should be) all familiar. The same procedure could be followed with materials in other areas; ideally speaking the materials should come from any and all basic courses. Practical considerations make this difficult, if not impossible. In any event, the point is that speech is required as a part of our general education program and is not an addendum.

I quite agree with Dean Hunt that the way is increasingly open for speech to play a significant part in the education of the whole personality, with philosophical and moral considerations integral rather than incidental. This requires, above all, teachers who themselves are liberally educated. We need more of them.

PAUL R. ANDERSON,
Pennsylvania College for Women

The paper on Rhetoric and General Education by Dean Hunt cannot fail to be appreciated as good common sense

by all who sanction the idea that general education means anything as a program distinct from the traditional type of liberal arts education. Interdependence of subject matter, departments and areas is the central idea of an organized program of general education; and in all such programs with which I am familiar 'communications' under some name occupies a prominent place.

If this basic skill or art is the most important factor in an organized program of general education, then it must itself yield to the overall pattern of unity and become a part of the general integration. Dean Hunt's argument 'to have work in communications given not separately, but in connection with the courses in general education' is sound. Anyone who has ever taught has had the experience of observing the sudden increase in alertness of a class when a phase of the class discussion is pointedly related to the work pursued in another course.

I should not want to appear to suggest that the instruction in communications be taken over by the staff responsible for the teaching of the courses in sciences, humanities, or social sciences, but rather that, as Dean Hunt suggests, 'the instructors in speaking and writing would thus come to have an intimate relation to the courses in general education.' And the writing and speaking courses would then be one of them.

The classical rhetoric of Aristotle has served admirably the purposes of scholars through the many intervening centuries and is still basic to all modern variations of it. Such specializations as English for Engineers, Business Writing, and the like would, in my opinion, be well replaced by fundamental application of principles of good writing, good speaking, and good listening.

LLOYD C. EMMONS,
Michigan State College

My comment is very simple: What does Mr. Hunt mean by rhetoric? What does it embrace, what teaching methods does it employ, and what sort and degree of competence does it demand in the teacher?

HOWARD MUMFORD JONES,
Harvard University

Rhetoric as a formal subject has been losing ground. With the Greeks, the Romans, and the Mediaeval schoolmen, rhetoric was an essential part of education, and oratory a highly respected accomplishment. So it has been in our own country until recently. Gradually the feeling began to spread that oratory was a way of 'putting over' ideas, that it lacked integrity, and that we should concern ourselves with subject matter alone. We became unconscious Platonists, fearful of rhetoric as an appeal to the passions and as a displacement of reason.

Dean Hunt brings back the ideal of the educated man as 'the good man skilled in speaking,' establishing it on relatively new and important grounds. These grounds are essentially two. In the first place, it is generally agreed that 'ability to communicate effectively' is a trait of the educated man. But communication is only a new name for the enterprise of rhetoric. It should be added that communication enlarges the scope of rhetoric. It is not only speaking; it is also writing. In the second place, Dean Hunt insists that rhetoric should not be regarded as a special course in the curriculum. It is not a self-contained skill, and must not be taught as a separate subject. He refers in most generous terms to the doctrine of the Harvard Report that the use of English should become part of the training in general education. Thus, a student should receive criticism of his ability to communicate as part of his training in a general

subject. Hence form becomes linked with content, and, being thus linked, achieves new validity.

In this way, we will be furnishing not only our students, but our teachers as well, with a much needed article of education. On the whole, our scholars have not been good writers; it is not unfair to say that scholarly writing in America is on a lower level than English and French writing of the same type. Scholarship has its own jargon. Communication is the commerce of ideas among the body politic by which a prosperous intellectual economy is secured. Technical jargon is like a blood clot which frustrates the circulation necessary to the life of the social organism. Today there is inability to communicate as between (a) a scholar in one field and a scholar in another, and (b) the scholar and the layman.

When we conceive of rhetoric as communication, we see that it is part of education only because it is part of the good life itself. Democracy is the ideal of a world which, on the one hand, is culturally rich because of the diversity of its members—individuals, groups, nations; and, on the other, is unified by means of free channels of communication. Without communication of ideas, sentiments, viewpoints, the world remains in a state of anarchy.

Finally, we teachers have a professional stake in rhetoric. To teach is to communicate, to transmit our cultural heritage to the new generation, to establish a link between past and present (including the future), between age and youth, between wisdom and vitality. Again it is unwise to deal with the problem of 'how to teach' separately from that of 'what to teach'; in short, once more, form and content should remain joined.

RAPHAEL DEMOS,
Harvard University

Departments of Speech, like Schools of Education, have a bad name, as we all know, with Faculties of Arts and Sciences. Often enough they merit it, but they are sometimes most derided by those with the dimmest ideas of what they either are or should be doing. Dean Hunt's address will help these scoffers (and those in the Departments who justify them by taking too limited views of their subject) if it makes them imagine seriously what could warrant the ancient estimate of Rhetoric.

'To speak effectually of the full force of this science, we shall finde nothing done with reason which hath not been brought about by the helpe of Eloquence, so that she remaineth the chiefest guide of all our thoughts and deeds, being the only instrument of the wise and learned.' (*Nicocles*, 9, Thomas Forrest's translation.)

Plato's overshadowed rival, Isocrates, to whom he pays such a noble compliment at the end of the *Phaedrus*, is here claiming for the whole man—for whom general education toils—what Platonists, if not Plato, claim for the organ of intellectual research. It will do no harm to mention that what is here translated by 'Eloquence' is 'Logos' (see Werner Jaeger *Paideia* III, 89) or to stress that comprehension and creative ordering need even more care than utterance in rhetoric. For they are its sources—in so far as it can be serviceable to good.

I am glad Dean Hunt put in his fine paragraph on the misuses of rhetoric, and that he pointed to Aristotle as professional preparation for instructors. But there are things in the *Rhetoric* to hearten the unscrupulous, debate can cultivate many diseases—from party fever to the floating conscience. I think we need *Phaedrus* and *Republic* to make us remember what discourse is for. And I find one sentence in the address which

could easily enough be misread: 'The progress of thought in general education has been to give less concern to ultimate philosophic or scientific truth, and more to the mental and emotional habits which produce good human relations.' If this is praising a return to wholeness, I can applaud; but if it is making a separation between what are mutually means and ends in the soul, then I become still more concerned about those mental habits.

As to work in 'communication' (a label which is likely to leave out just what is of most value in the ideal rhetoric, the judgment of what is communicated) I think the Harvard and Iowa proposals will have somehow to be combined. We will have to bring 'the chiefest guide of all our thoughts and deeds' up to date in phrasing and in scope . . . up to date while exercising and nourishing the growing skills upon 'greatness in the common cares of man.' 'That only is genuine knowledge which returns as power,' remarked Coleridge. And though 'Intuition is expression' is far from the whole truth, ability in saying is normally the helpmeet to ability in seeing. For a further remark on the scope of rhetoric, I may perhaps quote from the close of my *Interpretation in Teaching*:

> In Rhetoric's care is that unity or, as Coleridge would have written, coadunation of the mind, which is, whatever the deviations, the aim behind and before our strivings—an increasing organic interinanimation of meanings, the biological growth of the mind in the individual and in a social inheritance maintaining the human advance.

I. A. Richards,
Harvard University

Dean Hunt's *leitmotif* is Cato's definition of the orator, made famous by Cicero, as 'a good man skilled in speaking.' In giving it wider application than the word 'orator' conveys today, he is not only within his rights but is rather close to the ancient idea, for the orator was anyone who had occasion to address his fellow men.

The word 'speaking' must not, of course, be conceived too narrowly, and Dean Hunt avoids doing so by occasionally bracketing writing and speaking or by use of the current technologism 'communication.' Nevertheless, to avoid misunderstanding, more emphasis is needed on the matter of having something to say and of composing one's thoughts neatly and in accordance with correct usage.

I have some reserves on one point: General education is, as I understand Dean Hunt, to be in the hands of instructors in speaking and writing. Why shouldn't it be in the hands, in part at least, of instructors in other fields who will also concern themselves with writing and speaking? But I wonder whether in general education it is necessary for all instructors to be able to teach all phases of the course equally well. I see no reason why there cannot be a compromise between generalists and specialists, why some of the so-called specialists, i.e., persons trained in history, or English, or languages, or science, may not have enough interest in general education to distill from their subjects those essentials which are valuable for general education. In such a scheme there would still be room for the 'specialist' in writing and speaking.

Professors of general education who have been trained only in general education, those who have not ploughed deep but have scratched the surface over a wide area, may have some difficulty in planting seeds that will grow.

That instructors in communication should be familiar with ancient rhetoric seems to me obvious, though I should not restrict that familiarity to Aristotle. A corollary to Dean Hunt's insistence

on rhetoric is that we should again study the classics widely and deeply, for no literature is more thoroughly steeped in rhetoric than Greek and Latin.

B. L. Ullman,
The University of North Carolina

I have read with warm response Dean Hunt's largely conceived, wise comment on the place of speaking in liberal and general education. It contrasts refreshingly with the constricted view of the purely technical specialist.

Yet I must differ at one point: the curricular device he proposes. I see no promise in having the instructor in speech play the role of a handmaid in the general education content-courses. I agree that the teaching of speech skills should not be separated from the teaching of content, but I think that the content as well as the skills should come from the same subject—Speech.

I have recently contributed a chapter on writing to the volume on Communication edited by Earl J. McGrath. In this chapter I have argued that 'You Can't Write Writing,' to use the title of an article by Wendell Johnson in the semantic journal *etc*. The student must write *about* something. He does this in all his college courses, except, generally, Composition and Speech, which have no serious content but only a sort of make-believe one. I have maintained that the required course in English should have its subject-matter restored, that students should study great literature and write about and from it. While studying great literature they learn more skill in writing (skill in correctness and clearness) than when they merely go through the motions of writing writing. The English staff can do much for them, but all departments of the college must help, for all have content and writing about it.

So far as I can see, as an outsider not versed in the mysteries of a department in which I have not taught, what is true of writing is true of the sister communication art, speaking. 'You Can't Speak Speaking.' The student must speak *about* something. He does this in all his college courses, except the required course in Speech if there is one (in this he talks about cabbages and kings and many other things but not about something). Yet there is assuredly something to talk about in Speech, namely, speeches—the great speeches of our democratic tradition, that is, basically, the Classical-Christian tradition, from the Greeks to Churchill and Roosevelt. These are precious to us by virtue of their human wisdom as well as rhetorical excellence. Oral discussion of them in freshman Speech could be as profitable as any on the campus, and less ragged.

For this as for any other worthy purpose, I agree with Dean Hunt that the instructor's 'best professional preparation' lies in Aristotle's *Ethics, Politics, Poetics,* and *Rhetoric*. In institutions where students are selected, these works are no less for the freshman, though the *Poetics* might be reserved for the literature departments. For I agree with Dean Hunt, again, when he asserts that a rediscovery and reemphasis on these works will inevitably result if the concepts of general education are really worked out.

Norman Foerster,
Duke University

Dean Hunt's paper will be welcome to many workers in general education. Rightly or not, courses in speech have been looked upon as merely another specialization clamoring for admission, a specialty concerned chiefly with the rhetorical tricks of propaganda or with the mechanics of posture, voice, and gesture. One reason for this attitude is that we have had a plethora of arguments based

somewhat shakily (as Dean Hunt points out) on salemanship, charm, and propaganda. His stress on the importance of general education for speech will reassure many who feared that the education of the orator was a concept lost in Quintillian and that nothing remained except the bag of oratorical tricks. Certainly the man skilled in speaking (if, as Dean Hunt does, we mean more by the phrase than the political spellbinder or the man who can sell the soap) is needed now, as always.

For what they may suggest I should like to stress explicitly two points which I feel are implicit in the paper. They are both fairly specific matters to which those interested in making the student skilled in speaking along the lines Dean Hunt suggests might well give attention. One is the plea that education in speaking should give the student some respect for his tools, verbal symbols. 'It's just a semantic difference' has now replaced 'It's just a matter of emphasis' as the incantation to accompany intellectual handwashing. If we are to believe a depressingly large proportion of our students (and colleagues too, unfortunately), we live in a very cosy world where we can all agree about everything, provided only that we use the right words with the right person; there are, in their minds, no problems of truth or value if we are merely willing to take the trouble to attach the right verbal labels. Semantics, originally nourished as a champion of thought against word-magic has apparently been apotheosized into a new Hecate. To realize that there are formidable problems in thought and communication does not relieve us of our intellectual responsibilities; it merely increases them.

Second, believing that words cannot mean anything anyway, the student lacks the wherewithal to think (now that the chief proponents of thinking-with-the-guts are in disrepute). Even if he did trust his words, however, he would not have an adequate set of analytical terms with which to think, no conceptual matrix within which to work. His terms are a weird mixture of common parlance with odd snippets drawn for adornment from Aristotle, Bentham, Carnap, Darwin, Dewey, Durkheim, Einstein, Freud, Hobbes, Locke, Kant, Jeans, Marx, Moses, Watson, Saints Paul and Thomas Aquinas, and scores of others. And only too frequently he acquired even this flotsam at fifth-hand. As a result, when he tries to think, he finds himself wallowing in a morass of terminological systems with conflicting and even contradictory definitions and postulates. With such jerry-built machinery serving as his mental apparatus, it is small wonder he decides something is wrong somewhere, gives up thinking, and excuses himself with 'It's just a matter of terminology.' *Any* one coherent set of terms which he can operate would serve him better than his present hybrid monster. Within the limits of this set he could think, talk, and write intelligently. Of course, the man skilled in speaking would be master of several different sets and would know the differences between them. But perhaps that is too much to hope for.

The more cynical of us will probably believe that Dean Hunt is overly sanguine in his view of the ease with which instruction in speech can be integrated with other parts of general education. Teachers of composition have long faced a similar problem. The tone of their papers and the frequency with which colleges revise their English programs both suggest that the road is not easy. But even the most tired of us will wish Dean Hunt's program success.

HAROLD B. DUNKEL,
University of Chicago

I want to express my gratitude to you for submitting my article on Rhetoric and General Education to educators not primarily interested in the field of Rhetoric. As my paper was intended for those familiar with the tradition of classical rhetoric little attempt was made at definition and exposition. I had in mind, of course, the Aristotelian tradition, which regards rhetoric as a study of the means of persuasion on all those questions which men gather to hear discussed in public assemblies,—deliberative, forensic, or occasional. I tried to give this tradition a contemporaneous meaning and content in a volume entitled *Persistent Questions in Public Discussion*, edited by A. M. Drummond and myself in 1925, but of course there is no reason to suppose that my readers should now be familiar with this book. A good many similar and better books have since appeared for training in speaking and writing, and in so far as they concern themselves with non-technical discussion of those subjects which in Aristotle's terms, 'all men debate and those who offer counsel speak,' they present both the form and content of rhetoric. In *Persistent Questions* the Aristotelian concept was used as a basis for the selection of model essays on the subjects of American Character and Ideals, Democracy, Liberty of Thought and Discussion, Economic Society, Education, Religion, Racial Problems, War and Peace, International Relations, Public Duty, Public Discussion. A teacher of rhetoric which deals with such content should possess a general training and competence in those fields which Aristotle designated as politics, ethics, and rhetoric. Modern specialists are inclined to regard this as impossible, but the programs of general education are a protest against the dominance of such specialists.

I believe the claim can be substantiated that modern rhetoric can have a field of its own, and that teachers of rhetoric should teach it. The subject, however, is so little understood by contemporary educators that it seems a practical compromise to suggest that well-trained teachers of rhetoric might make themselves competent to instruct in speaking and writing in many, if not all, of the courses described as courses in general education. The teaching methods employed are the methods of rhetorical criticism applied to student efforts at speaking and writing in these fields.

The history of the Boylston chair of rhetoric and oratory at Harvard, which I summarized in THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH for April, 1927,[1] affords an interesting commentary on the difficulty of maintaining any understanding of the classical tradition.

I can well understand the fear that too much talk about the 'good man skilled in speaking' may result in a revival of the easy platitudes about character. The Miltonic conception of a liberal education which fitted a man to perform justly, skilfully, and magnanimously all the offices, public and private, of war and peace, was grandiose, in the Miltonic manner, perhaps; but we have not abandoned the hope that a fair proportion of men with a general education shall be enabled to perform their public and private tasks 'justly, skilfully, and magnanimously,' and this, I believe, does give a new importance to Cato's ancient definition of the orator, even if he is only a member of a panel discussion group in a parent-teacher meeting.

On the interpretation of Charles W. Eliot, I can only suggest a rereading of his essay, A New Definition of the Cultivated Man.

EVERETT L. HUNT,
Swarthmore College

[1] Review of *The Copeland Reader*, pp. 202-6.

AMERICAN versus BRITISH DEBATING

A BRITISH IMPRESSION

Last spring when the four Cambridge University debaters were touring the United States we invited their leader, MR. DENZIL K. FREETH, *to submit the team's impressions of American debating. In their report published below Messrs. Cradock and Freeth invite refutation by Americans. We therefore submitted their article for comment to a representative group of coaches of intercollegiate debate and directors of debate tournaments. In a later issue we hope to publish reactions to the British analysis written by American intercollegiate debaters.*

DENZIL K. FREETH *is President of the Cambridge Union, the university debating society, and Chairman of the Cambridge University Conservative Association. During World War II he served in the Royal Air Force.* PERCY CRADOCK *is Ex-Vice President of the Cambridge Union and is Treasurer of the Cambridge Labour Club. He also served in the Royal Air Force during the war.*

P. E. LULL *is director of debate at Purdue University and president of Tau Kappa Alpha;* E. C. BUEHLER *is director of debate at the University of Kansas and president of Delta Sigma Rho;* H. H. PERRITT *is director of debate at the University of Virginia;* WAYNE C. EUBANK *is director of forensics at the University of New Mexico;* P. MERVILLE LARSON *is director of forensics at the University of Denver.* EDITOR.

For five weeks last spring four undergraduates of Cambridge University, England, representing the Cambridge Union Society, toured American universities and colleges. One team of two, Percy Cradock and Duncan Macrae, went westwards from New York to Colorado, and the other, comprising George Pattison and Denzil Freeth, kept to the eastern states from Vermont to Florida. In all, the teams debated thirty-eight times, at some places as a team and at others split, each Cambridge undergraduate having an American as a partner. Thus a fairly comprehensive view of American debating was obtained, and at the invitation of the Editor of THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH we have recorded our impressions.

1

The American style of debating is completely different from ours. The British method is modelled on that of the House of Commons, whence it draws its procedure and technique, and of which the Union Societies of Cambridge and Oxford have long been considered training grounds. It is political and oratorical. It accentuates audience appeal. The British debater, at home, is surrounded by his audience, who consider themselves a vital and equally important part of the debate, cheering, interrupting, barracking, asking questions. He learns how to put himself in touch with the audience and evoke in it an immediate response. He becomes an orator, a politician, a leader, and, if a lawyer, one whose most sympathetic atmosphere is that of the criminal court, with its strange mixture of fact and fiction cunningly compounded to sway the jury. To us, the American debater, on the other hand, seems desirous of training himself as a junior business executive who wishes to give to his senior a severely factual, eminently statistical report on a given situation, recommending a particular course of action. And thus the audience becomes superfluous, ignored, unwanted, and departs, alas, unmourned. Debating becomes a mental exercise for research students, an arid game of intellectual mathematicians, cold, hard, devoid of all emotions, a fitting forcing house for company lawyers or departmental civil servants.

2

With that great courtesy which is so typical of Americans at home, our hosts often tried to adopt the English style. A few jokes were introduced into their arguments, the audience were not merely tolerated but even appealed to, and having come to see the mad English, discovered with surprise, as one student put it to us, that debates can be fun. But it must be admitted that this attempt to do the English style was not often successful. One noticed an inability to grip an audience and win its sympathy, a lack of oratorical and rhetorical technique, an ignorance of how to insert humor into the very web and woof of a speech, except by extraneous funny stories which often impeded the flow of the argument, bringing one up short as against a brick wall. Above all, our American friends appeared to have no real feeling for words as living things or for their natural or emotive associations; words seemed to be regarded merely as mathematical symbols or handy labels with which to avoid deeper, rational analysis. Perhaps it might all be summed up as a lack of flexibility, too great a sense of logical argument and formal speech structure, impeding a conversational style without stiffness, humor that is genuinely unprepared, naturally witty rebuttals. To us a 'canned rebuttal' is a sin against the very name 'debate'. An excellent antidote for this we found in the Michigan cross-examination system, although five minutes is far too short a time to develop an idea.

3

To be frank—and this article is frank, since among friends it is natural and little else is much use—we see the cause of these defects, as they appear to us in two American institutions: the debate tournament and the debate coach.

Historically we are told the one has brought the other. Once, we hear, there was a Golden Age, when Americans debated for the fun of it, joyous, lively, bacchic stuff, not in order to win as a team by integrated case-presentation, but for the delights of argument, of swaying and convincing an audience, of making a speech. Tournaments have dragged debating down, professionalised it, stereotyped it, turned it into an annexe of the faculty and examination syllabus. Debate coaches, faculty men, appeared to direct all debating energies, to turn debating into a speaking contest, to sheer it of all but argumentative essentials so that debating victories might figure on the prospectus with scholastic successes; and the audience left unsung, and interest in debating flagged, and the careless rapture and heady joys of oratory fled. For, though as a critic he is useful, the debate coach is really superfluous, teaching in oratory, what good speakers know instinctively and what bad ones will never learn, and otherwise things that should be taught in composition classes, or learned from experience by contact with other debaters and an audience alive. Semantics and phonetics are of far less use to debaters than a study of the great orators of the world. Demosthenes, Burke, Lincoln, Roosevelt, Churchill can teach far more in a week than debate coaches in a year.

4

Our message is: 'Set American debating free!' You will reduce your average level of efficiency, admittedly, but your giants will be greater far.

This article is avowedly polemical. We hope it will be roundly refuted by Americans believing their standard to be

higher than ours. We hope to welcome American teams in Britain, who will prove that it is.

Free speech is the great inheritance of the English-speaking peoples; it is an inheritance of which we must prove ourselves fit.

DENZIL K. FREETH,
PERCY CRADOCK,
Cambridge University

SOME AMERICAN REPLIES

Considering the shortness of their visit, Messrs. Freeth and Cradock have exhibited keen powers of observation in spotting some of the major *faults* of American debating. If they had actually inspected a few of our tournaments they might have had cause for even greater dismay! But their recorded 'impressions' of our debating hardly constitute a fair appraisal for there is no acknowledgment of any of our positive qualities. Not all of our debating is done in tournaments, but in some of our tournaments, changes are taking place. For example, at the National Forensic Conference held at Purdue University, and at the next West Point Invitational Tournament, most of the debates will be held before student class audiences. Outside the tournaments, our British visitors might have noted the breadth and depth of preparation that is characteristic of most of our debaters, the thoroughness of their analyses, the consistency and coherence of their arguments, and their persistent zeal to find the facts in the case.

I'm not sure that our critics are correct when they state that the American and British styles are completely different! Although no one can deny that all of the faults that were mentioned do exist, not all of our American debaters are guilty of these practices. Some of our student speakers can discriminate between evidence that is valid and that which is not; many can use reasoning effectively, and do a pretty good job of convincing an audience (when they have an audience). On the other hand, I have heard British debaters who made occasional use of factual material, and even went so far sometimes as to present cases that had a semblance of logical arrangement! The truth may be that each class of debaters does some things better than the other and that both the British and the American debaters can profit by these opportunities to observe the other fellow's way of getting the job done.

But, the implication that we could 'set American debating free' from its faults by going over to the British system doesn't make sense. Debating, as the Cambridge gentlemen describe (and practice) it, is pretty frothy stuff. Speaking in the Cambridge manner, 'Fun for all and all for fun' may deserve a place on the program, but it shouldn't become the whole show. With 'its strange mixture of fact and fiction cunningly compounded,' to 'evoke an immediate response' from an audience, it may well be 'joyous, lively, bacchic stuff' for the participant, and highly entertaining for the audience, but it falls far short of the solid values of training and experience that debating can provide. I like circuses, and I enjoy hearing British teams 'debate.' Both of these types of performances are entertaining. Furthermore, I hope we can continue to schedule at least one debate each year with a British team. But a good forensic diet needs variety and something substantial for the main course. The 'careless rapture and heady joys of oratory' won't sustain life for very long!

Again, it seems to me that our British

critics have been too harsh on the Debate Coach, when they label the 'coach' as one of the major causes for the conditions that they found. It may be true that some coaches get over-anxious in their desire to produce 'winning teams.' But the rank and file of our coaches are good teachers, trying to inculcate in their student debaters concepts of straight thinking and effective speaking that will serve them well in their later lives. I see no more necessity for a Debate Coach, than for a Good Teacher in any academic subject area. It cannot be denied that some students, given access to a good library and opportunities for experience, might become 'self-made' persuaders, without payment of any tuition fee. But the same could be said of writers, historians, engineers, lawyers, and business men. Furthermore, I understand that at Cambridge and Oxford, there are very extensive tutorial systems, with Dons advising and counselling students on all phases of their activites. Messrs. Freeth and Cradock should realize that although we go about our teaching job a little differently in America, the basic principles are essentially the same.

Good teaching should be an essential part of debating activities in England and in America. Good debate teachers are aware of the great potential values of debating, not only as training for future Congressional and Parliamentary debaters, but also as preparation for the less formal, but no less important, speaking in the world of business, industry, and the professions, and in the multitudinous activities of community life. Such teachers can do much, *on both sides of the Atlantic,* to rid debating of its faults, to develop a kind of speaking that is effective, not only as far as the immediate results are concerned, but also aims at producing impressions and convictions that will endure. Finally, Good Debate Teachers, shunning 'argument for the sake of argument,' will seek constantly to develop in their students, British and American, a realization that Freedom of Speech carries with it *responsibility for that which is spoken!* and that to fulfill these responsibilities, men must first know whereof they speak—the speaking techniques come afterward.

P. E. Lull,
Purdue University

The gentlemen from Cambridge apparently do not think much of American debating. Their observations, although frankly and graciously presented, give us little that we do not already know and represent a narrow, limited, and somewhat superficial aspect of our debate activity in general. They strike a blow where perhaps it is most needed, namely tournament debating. What the gentlemen say on this point will no doubt be roundly cheered by many of our readers. While this criticism may have some validity, it is not a vital or crucial one. It does not strike at the roots from which the American system has grown and developed. Most certainly, it is not a cornerstone in the foundation of our present forensic structure.

Tournament debating has had its greatest expansion since the war. Its overuse is an abuse, not a basic fault of our system. It is definitely not the tail that wags the dog. Most of our tournaments form only a part of a larger program of speech activities which include discussion, the legislative assembly, oratory, extempore speaking, radio speaking, after-dinner and other forms of speaking. Furthermore, most tournaments feature quality ranking of debaters as well as wins and losses. Some use quality rating only.

In getting a true picture of the differences between British and American debating, we must go beyond the limited comparisons given by the gentlemen from England. Our blueprint for debating calls for different goals, different methods of approach, and consequently, different emphasis from that of our British friends. All along the line, through courses, textbooks, and faculty instruction, our students are taught certain skills and techniques for establishing the truth concerning vital issues which are discussed on the platform. We teach our students that truth can best be revealed by the use of pertinent facts, expert testimony, and sound methods of reason. This training reaches far and wide even into our secondary schools where decision debates predominate. We condemn the haphazard use of platitudes and glittering generalities, of loaded words, and irrelevant arguments. We discourage anything and everything aimed to draw out the applause of the ill informed, unsuspecting listener.

Our debaters are taught that a debate should be judged on the merits of debating, not on the merits of the question. Hence they aim their discourse at the discriminating listener, 'the censure of which must o'erweight a whole theatre of others.'

The American debater appeals to the critical, expert judge. The British, on the other hand, design their debates to appeal to a large layman audience, a large undiscriminating jury, ready to laugh and cheer at the human foibles depicted by the speakers. They love the personal digs, the political appeals, the emotional fireworks, and the loaded words. By tradition and training, British debating is designed for audience appeal. They choose popular questions which can be treated in the lighter vein. One can have fun debating, 'Should we pity our grandchildren?'

I, too, would like to present a few impressions of my own about British debating. I have heard their teams for over 25 years. During the first years, their free and easy style featuring audience appeal, was a welcome tonic for the hard hitting contest minded American debater. Their influence was a wholesome one for us, for they helped us in the 'devaluation' of contests for victory. But as I look over the years, certain weaknesses of British debating stand out. Their speakers had little to say. They were, as a rule, poorly informed on the question. The listener seeking light and information on the subject went home disappointed. Their talent for playing up to the audience, at which they were supposed to excel, was highly over-rated. In many instances, the Americans were a good match for them at their own game. Stale jokes and puns predominated their attempts at humor. There was little of that sparkling wit which springs from the unexpected turns in the course of argument.

The British debaters were often not as good as their applause and acclaim indicated. Many came to see the mad British. They were curious. Furthermore, the visiting debaters had the advantage of being the honored guests on the platform. Every courtesy was offered them. When they spoke, they had the rapt attention of the audience, an audience somewhat gullible in its admiration of speakers with a broad British accent which reflected culture and learning far superior to that of the Kansas plains.

In conclusion, let it be said that no attempt has been made to demonstrate that American debating is superior to the British. An attempt to do this is childish. What the British do, serves their purpose. What we do, serves ours.

There is good and bad in each system and we can learn much from each other.

E. C. Buehler,
University of Kansas

Alas, the censure by our Cambridge friends is more deserved than comforting. Unless we admit failure, we must refute our critics and mitgiate our errors.

How can we refute? By posing three questions: 1. Is it enough for training in debating to be 'political and oratori cal' (unless we interpret the latter in the classical sense)? 2. Did the Cambridge men have an opportunity to view accurately the nature of training be ing given American debaters? 3. Must the effects they describe necessarily follow the causes they credit?

The obviously intended answer to each question is, 'no!' We are seeking something more than glibness, stage presence, and skill at repartee; we also attempt to teach thoroughness and sound judgment. The English debaters never have adequate opportunity to observe our debate programs in their entirety. They do not hear our demonstration debates, our student congresses, our speakers' bureaus, our intra-mural debates. Instead, they hear a few dozen teams (undoubtedly the best the host schools have to offer) debate a topic for the first, and probably only time, before an audience larger than they have ever faced before, against adversaries to whom, for various reasons, they are bound to feel inferior. The Cambridge men have never participated in nor observed an American debate tournament; nor have they been subjected to instruction and criticism by a debate 'coach.' They detect only the abominable decision-winning taint which has unfortunately, but not necessarily, affected these two 'institutions.' They depart our shores unaware of the economy of the first and the pedagogy of the second in giving our students intensive and extensive training in public speaking.

How can we mitigate? By confessing that we are guilty of most of the sins for which we are condemned—and more which our critics did not perceive—and reorienting our programs to the good in our system. We can do much to correct our errors if we will: 1. junk the emphasis upon winning judges' decisions—with the concomitant bad speaking habits such as the mechanized delivery of canned statistical abstracts; 2. seek out audiences and develop an awareness that a speaker must interest before he can inform or persuade; 3. debate numerous topics instead of one national one; 4. vary our debate programs to include more participation in student congresses, debates before civic groups, etc., in lieu of some of the tournaments; 5. encourage the growth of student debating societies (without faculty supervision) similar to the Union Societies of Cambridge and Oxford; 6. expose more of our students to the best speeches and arguments —to Burke, Webster, Churchill, and Roosevelt.

Perhaps what our British cousins are really criticising are defects in our culture and educational system which teachers of public speaking cannot easily correct. Before we can be sure that all the fault lies with tournaments and coaches, they must demonstrate that American students who have had benefit of neither are better speakers than the ones they met on their tour. Probably such students would be duller than was one member of the Cambridge team which toured the United States in 1947.

H. H. Perritt,
University of Virginia

The ultimate value of a debate program as practiced in a nation lies in how

well the program serves the institutional patterns of that nation. With this assumption in mind, let us remember that the British system of education is far less rigidly organized than ours. British debating is, and rightly so, more of a discussion type of speaking, rather than a well organized presentation of pertinent facts. What's wrong with excellent, yes, even rigid 'organization' for Americans? Any casual British traveler in this country, who has witnessed a football team in action or one of our many gigantic assembly lines in operation, should realize that organization is at a premium in this country.

As to humor, most of us are willing to concede that the British are past masters in its use. Actually, our general pattern of public speaking does not contain as much humor as the British. I venture to say that this is a traditional and not a studied variation. Nevertheless, I hear hundreds of debaters in after dinner speeches every year and most of them are passingly witty, that is for American audiences.

I make no attempt to defend the tournament system. It has its pros and cons. I decry the usual absence of an audience. But I deny that the finished debater is lacking in audience contact. Since there is no formal debate training offered in the British educational curriculum, it is no wonder that they see little value in our tournament system, which affords tens of thousands of students a chance to practice debate principles. Certainly our system reaches far more students proportionately, even when confined to the college level, than the British system. Thousands of students who might never have made a public speech, become reasonably articulate when enrolled in our 'organized' program of debate training. It is my belief that in this country we are interested in developing 'middle-sized' as well as 'big' giants.

I was amazed at the blatant misinformation the British writers displayed concerning the content of American debate courses, primarily semantics and phonetics, as they put it. In some 15 years of debate directing, I don't recall having so much as discussed these concepts, much less taught either in connection with debate. Semantically speaking we do like to start our discussions with a clear definition of terms. According to John Dewey's analysis of reflective thinking, this process is called 'location and definition of the problem.'

Back to our original and basic question. How well do the products of our forensic system fit into our institutional patterns? We think exceedingly well, since the law profession calls for graduates with debate training; industry searches eagerly for those who can analyze and organize, two elements engendered by our debate system; Houses of our State and National legislatures are most generously sprinkled with former debaters. For example, at the present time three of Florida's four foremost citizens are former University of Florida leading debaters; namely, United States Senator Spessard Holland, Representative George Smathers (voted the most likely young Congressman to succeed), and Governor Fuller Warren. These distinctions in one state are not exceptional.

Finally, let Alexander Meiklejohn, internationally known educator and former President of Amherst College, whom even the British will remember in the field of education, speak for the products of our debate system. In referring to groups that stood out as intellectually the best, best in college work and best in promise of future intellectual achievement he said:

Much as I should like to do so, I can not draw the line around my own favorite students of philosophy, nor the leaders in mathematics, nor those successful in biology; nor could I fairly award the palm to the Phi Beta Kappa men who have excelled in all their subjects. It seems to me that stronger than any other group, tougher of intellectual fiber, keener in intellectual interest, better equipped to battle with coming problems, are the college debaters—the boys, who, apart from their regular studies, band themselves together for intellectual controversy with each other and with their friends of other colleges.

The British way of life is not the American way. The British philosophy of education culminates in a radically different system from ours. In many respects even the political philosophies of the two countries have varied greatly. Therefore, in two nations whose cultural and institutional patterns vary widely, why shouldn't their philosophy and practice of debate (and discussion), in functioning bases of all democracies, vary also? I think the British system of debating is fine for the British. In spite of its faults, when viewed in the light of the end result—the finished debater, I think that our system of forensics is fundamentally sound.

WAYNE C. EUBANK,
University of New Mexico

Having read and reread the observations of our distinguished British debaters, I am inclined to speak from the amen corner rather than from the side of the loyal opposition. American debating is altogether too often in the vacuous sterility of the tournament contest room, and 'coached' for the sharp practices and strategy thereof. The tournament is undoubtedly a valuable practice ground for the neophyte, but to make his primary objective the winning of a debate, and then reward him with medals and trophies seems to be distortion or perversion of values. At the same time it scarcely seems appropriate or fair to an audience to put these same neophytes in a public place to declaim their ideas. The Oxford and Cambridge Unions provide this training ground in Britain, and perhaps we should revise our tournament procedures in order to secure similar results.

On another point, however, I find myself in some disagreement. It is possible that not all debating should be geared to the popular audience. Perhaps the junior executive does need experience in presenting effectively before a board of directors or a labor management conference the 'factual, eminently statistical report of a given situation.' Since large numbers of our American debaters find their way into business organizations rather than into legislatures or Congress, perhaps they are receiving training well-suited to their objectives. A study of what happens to American debaters and their testimony as to the value of their debate experience would support such an observation.

Good debating, whether British or American, is good speaking, and good speaking must be adapted to the kind of audience addressed. Not all speaking situations suitable for debate are political rallies or Congressional sessions. Sometimes the audiences desire facts and information upon which to base more intelligent decisions. The good debaters should recognize this and do as the Romans do when in Rome.

P. MERVILLE LARSON,
University of Denver

LANGUAGE DIFFICULTIES ON THE INTERNATIONAL FORUM

Theodore M. Gutmans

Introduction

WE have often heard that the lack of understanding and cooperation between the peoples of the world is due not so much to an inherent difference in the way of thinking as to the impossibility of grasping exactly the purport of the words conveyed in their several languages. In other words: if we could only remove this obstacle we could improve international comprehension and thus bring about a closer collaboration between nations.

In this connection we should not forget that the term 'understanding' covers a double range of meanings. On the one hand it means '*realizing* what the other party wishes to bring out.' On the other hand it includes *sharing* the other party's opinion, or at least getting closer to it, and is thus synonymous with *rapprochement*.

Although these two ways of 'understanding' *may* coincide (as in the case of the two leading Anglo-Saxon nations) they not always do; otherwise, no strife could have originated e.g. between Latin American countries, and the century-long hostilities between the two most populated Slavic states could hardly be explained. Nevertheless, on the international scene, technical comprehension appears to be a prerequisite of *rapprochement*.

The political aspect of 'understanding' being necessarily beyond the scope of a linguistic paper, we shall have to deal here solely with the possibilities of facilitating comprehension in the technical sense. In this regard I wish to describe a method currently used by international organizations: the technique which allows for a limited number of 'world languages' to be used *ad libitum* by the speaker, while it is made possible for the listener to 'take in' the speech in any other of those languages.

The Five Language Regime

Whereas the League of Nations recognized only two official languages (French and English) the United Nations, and in its wake the eleven so-called specialized agencies,[1] has adopted the following five official languages (in the order as listed in Article 11 of the U. N. Charter): Chinese, French, Russian, English, and Spanish. Thus, the text of the United Nations Charter as laid down in any one of these five tongues is considered equally authentic. On the other hand, in accordance with the rules of procedure of the main U. N. bodies (General Assembly, Security Council, Economic and Social Council, Trusteeship Council), 'English and French shall be the work-

THEODORE M. GUTMANS, *originally from Latvia, spent over twenty years in Belgium, where he studied and received a Ph.D. degree in Languages from the University of Brussels. He is the author of various contributions to European linguistic journals, mainly in the field of phonetics and spelling, and also a* French-English Spelling Dictionary, *Brussels, 1945. In 1947 he joined the staff of the United Nations at Lake Success, where he has been acting successively as interpreter, translator, and editor.* *Dr. Gutmans expresses his appreciation to his colleagues of the United Nations Interpretation and Translation Divisions who assisted him with their suggestions.*

[1] International Labor Organization; Food and Agricultural Organization; Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization; International Civil Aviation Organization; International Bank for Reconstruction and Development; International Monetary Fund; International Refugee Organization; International Telecommunications Union; Universal Postal Union; World Health Organization; International Trade Organization.

ing languages,' 'speeches made in either of the working languages shall be interpreted into the other working language,' 'speeches made in any of the other three official languages shall be interpreted into both working languages,' and 'verbatim records shall be drawn up in the working languages.' The definition of the concept *working language* may be gathered from the foregoing quotations.

Pursuant to a recent resolution of the General Assembly (Paris, 8 December 1948) Spanish has now been included as a working language of the General Assembly, and the above mentioned rules of procedure have been amended accordingly. However, no such change has so far occurred in the regulations governing the other main bodies of the United Nations.

A further rule provides that 'any representative may make a speech in a language other than the [five] official languages. In this case, he shall himself provide for interpretation into one of the working languages.' However, except for some two or three speeches in Portuguese delivered by Brazilian representatives—this last rule does not appear to have been taken advantage of too frequently, if at all. Consequently, all delegates while making speeches use English, French, Russian, Spanish, or Chinese.

The number of speeches delivered in Chinese has hitherto been extremely small (with the exception of the Military Staff Committee, where Chinese representatives use their own language). Russian is currently used by the three Soviet delegations (USSR, Byelorussia, Ukraine) who resort to English only in exceptional cases. Spanish is spoken by the 18 Hispanic countries represented in the United Nations;[2] however, occasionally some of the Latin American delegates prefer to speak English (or, sometimes, French). There are only four French speaking countries which are Members of the United Nations (France, Belgium, Luxembourg, Haiti); however, some of the representatives from other countries (Turkey, Greece, Lebanon, etc.) use French, although other delegates from the same countries have a preference for English. Though it seems probable that after some of the other South and Southeast European countries (Italy, Roumania, Albania, Portugal, etc.) will have been admitted to membership French may be heard more often on the U. N. forum, it is a fact that at the present time an overwhelming majority of delegates use English both for their speeches and in the documents they submit to the Organization. The decline of French as a diplomatic language (the supremacy of which went unchallenged until the outbreak of the First World War)—though it may be deplored—cannot be denied, and this accounts for the procedural rivalry between French and Spanish (which is represented by a far greater number of delegations) and for the adoption of the above mentioned resolution, dated 8 December 1948.

[2] Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Salvador, Uruguay, Venezuela.

The Interpreter's Task

So far I have not made any mention of the missing link in this Tower of Babel: the interpreter. As some admirer of the adepts of this 'language-swapping' trade put it: 'What counts is not what the delegate says but what the interpreter says he says.'

The traditional, and doubtless *more accurate*, system of so-called 'consecutive' interpretation—in which the interpreter intervenes only after the delegate has completed his speech—although still widely employed in the Security Council (in view of the political significance of

its debates) and in U. N. field missions has been almost entirely superseded in the other U. N. bodies by the new time-saving device of 'simultaneous' interpretation.[3] Instead of being seated at or near the conference table the simultaneous interpreter is completely isolated from the deliberating group and from the audience: closeted in a glass booth, sometimes hardly visible to the delegates and public,[4] he is connected with them solely by means of a set of earphones and a microphone. He starts his interpretation a few seconds after a delegate has begun his speech, and while he is delivering in the other tongue what he has heard several seconds ago he has to listen to that part of the discourse which he is going to convey a few seconds later. Thus he stays only a nominal length of time behind the speaker and has to complete his interpretation practically at the very instant the delegate ends his speech. The main technical difficulty therefore resides in the fact that the simultaneous interpreter has to listen and speak at the same time, and he is trained to avoid listening to his own words and to 'convert' almost automatically one language into the other.

This set-up requires a very strict specialization: with very few exceptions the interpreter is trained to translate always *into* the same language (usually his mother tongue) although—if he perfectly understands more than one additional language—he may interpret speeches delivered in *several* languages other than the one he speaks in the booth. Thus, in consideration of the existence of the five official languages as mentioned above, the work is distributed among five booths: the English (speaking), the French (speaking), the Spanish (speaking), the Russian (speaking), and the Chinese (speaking) booth. In every one of these booths there are normally two or three people interpreting each *from* one or several languages.

The delegate who has the floor is connected with the interpreting booths through his own microphone, whereas the other delegates and the public use earphones which can be switched *ad libitum* on to the English, French, Spanish, Russian, or Chinese booth or 'channel,' so that every person present is in a position to hear all the speeches or any speech in the language of his or her choice.

Linguistic Impediments

The main linguistic difficulties confronting the simultaneous interpreter naturally flow from the dissimilarities between the two languages he is working on (the 'from' language and the 'into' language). While there exist some minor inconveniences, such as exaggerated speed, speakers' poor elocution and imperfect accent (in the last respect, delegates whose mother tongue is one of the five official languages enjoy a rather unjustified privilege), the two following complications may be singled out as particularly significant: 1. discrepancy in length or duration, and 2. difference in word order. A further intricacy resides in the existence of cognates, idiomatic sayings, and proverbs.

It is a well known fact that English is more concise than most other languages; e.g. French and also Spanish usually require a far greater number of words to express an identical idea.[5] Striking examples are the names of some U. N.

[3] Devised about 1925 by Edw. Filene; first used on a large scale at the Nuremberg Trials, 1945.

[4] A first-time visitor of a meeting at Lake Success made the following comment: 'Isn't it marvelous how these interpreting machines work? They're almost better than human beings!'

[5] The greater length, as compared with English, of Russian and Chinese sentences seems to be due principally to the long endings in the case of Russian, and the difficulty of conveying certain new concepts in the case of Chinese.

committees, such as: 'Committee on arrangements for consultation with non-governmental Organizations' which it is impossible to convey in adequate French in any shorter way than: 'Comité chargé d'examiner les dispositions à prendre en vue de consultations avec les organisations non gouvernementales'; and 'Interim Co-ordinating Committee for International Commodity Arrangements' as against 'Commission provisoire de coordination des ententes internationales relatives aux produits de base.' We find an even greater discrepancy of length in the following sentence: ' . . . the Office . . . made the information available in publications and *in response to enquiries,*' the French translation being: '. . . le Bureau . . . a rendu l'utilisation des informations possible grâce à ses publications et *par ses réponses aux demandes de renseignements qui lui étaient adressées.*'[6] To give some typical examples from Spanish: 'activities carried out under this resolution' is conveyed by 'actividades llevadas a cabo de conformidad con esta resolución'; 'Trusteeship Council' is 'Consejo de Administración Fiduciaria,' 'trust territories' are 'territorios fideicometidos,' and (e.g. General Assembly) 'session' usually has to be translated with 'período de sesiones' (de la Asamblea general), inasmuch as 'sesión' mostly implies an individual (2 or 3 hours') meeting.

However, while Spanish is a comparatively flexible language and frequently adopts new terms along the lines followed by English, French is more traditional and has to confine itself to what exists. The English word *implementation* is currently translated with *implementación* (even the Russians have adopted *implyemyentatsiya*); the French translator or interpreter has to reflect every time before he decides which of the following would be the most appropriate under the circumstances: *mise à exécution, mise en application, mise en oeuvre,* or a similar formulation.

As regards word order the five official languages can be divided into several groups: 1. English and French have a comparatively fixed sequence: potential short adverbs, subject, predicate, object, followed by the remainder of the sentence. 2. The Spanish and the Russian sentence allow of rather greater freedom in this respect, frequently starting off with the verb or some other expression. 3. Chinese comes under an altogether different category (see below).

Thus, 'se declara abierta la sesión' has to be conveyed by 'I call the meeting to order' (or: 'will the meeting please come to order') and 'je déclare la séance ouverte' respectively; 'tiene la palabra el representante de B.' by 'I recognize the representative of B.' (or: 'I call upon the representative of B.') and 'je donne la parole au représentant de la B.' (or: 'la parole est au représentant de la B.'). These are, of course, cut and dried locutions; in more complex sentences it is, as a rule, easier to interpret *into* Spanish or Russian (since the English or French word order can usually be preserved) than *from* those languages (where you may have to wait until the subject or the predicate turns up). Cf. 'soglasit'sya na podobnoye pryedlozheniye my otnyud' nye v sostoyanii' for 'we are by no means in a position to agree to such a proposal.'

In Chinese the word order is extremely different from that used in the foregoing languages. In this respect Chinese is somewhat similar to German, and if and when German becomes an official language of the United Nations this will be an additional source of difficulty, espe-

[6] Exceptionally, we find the reverse ratio in: 'La division est de droit quand elle est demandée' for 'Parts of a proposal may be voted on separately if a representative requests that the proposal be divided.'

cially in translations *from* German, due to the final position of the verb in subordinate clauses. Let me quote just one example which is typical of Chinese, the words or word groups are numbered according to the Chinese word order, corresponding words or word groups of the English translation bearing the same number:

'tsó[1] t'iēn[1] wei[2] yüán[2] hui[2] lǐ[3] tê[3] ī[4] wei[4] wei[5] yüán[5] shuō[6]: yaò[7] shìh[7] t'iēn[8] ch'ì[8] hao[7], t'ā[9] yüàn[10] ì[10] lì[11] k'ò[11] tsò[12] fēi[13] chī[13] tao[14] pā-lê-ssŭ-t'an[15] ch'u.[14][7]

'One[4] of[4] the[5] members[5] of[3] the[3] Commission[2] stated[6] yesterday' [that] weather[8] permitting[7] he[9] would[10] like[10] to[12] board[12] a[13] plane[13] for[14] Palestine[15] immediately.[11]'

Speaking of cognates, it is obvious that not only interpreters but also translators are confronted with this difficulty. However, in view of the tempo of their work interpreters are more liable to be misled by similarity of appearance. French *éventuellement* stands for English *possibly* while English *eventually* generally corresponds to French *en fin de compte*. French *actuellement* is English *at present* whereas English *actually* has to be translated into French with *réellement* or *effectivement*. English *comprehensive* is conveyed in French by *global* or *d'ensemble;* French *compréhensif* is, as a rule, *comprehending* or *understanding*. Spanish *criterio* is quite often not *criterion* but *opinion*, and *excuso decir* has nothing to do with 'to excuse' and means just *needless to say* (in French: *inutile de dire*). In Russian, cognates with English or French are comparatively more scarce but none the less dangerous: *diapazon* in radio terminology is Russian for (frequency) *range*, the French equivalent being *gamme* (de fréquence). Russian *khladnokrovny* (or *khladnokroviye*)—like French (de) *sang-froid*, Spanish (con) *sangre fría*—should only exceptionally (e.g. when connected with murder) be rendered by 'cold (-) blood (ed),' otherwise by *cool* or *indifferent:* the English term being the only one of the four that implies outright cruelty whereas the other three convey nothing but calm or self-control.

The last example—which represents a 'semantic cognate'—brings us to one more impediment encountered by simultaneous interpreters, which however can be more easily by-passed. Some of the delegates make rather extensive use of proverbs which sometimes do have and sometimes do not have close equivalents in the other language. If the interpreter happens to recall on the spur of the moment that the English equivalent for 'En casa del herrero el cuchillo es de palo' is 'The smith's mare and the cob-

[7] Here is the same sentence in the original Chinese script:

昨天委員會裏的一位委員說：要是天氣好，他願意立刻坐飛機到巴勒斯坦去，

bler's wife are always the worst shod,' he might as well use it although an English speaking representative might subsequently make reference to a mare or a cobbler, thus causing trouble for the interpreters from English into Spanish. Otherwise, it is safe enough to refer simply to the *Spanish* proverb which says 'In the blacksmith's house the knives are made of wood.' Similarly, it would be all right to translate the Russian proverb 'Chto napisano pyerom, tovo nye vyrubish toporom' with: '*As the Russians say*: what is written by the pen cannot be cut out even with an axe.' For, after all, the aim of the interpreter is bringing about comprehension and not creating works of everlasting literary value.

Speech is Paramount

In the foregoing remarks I have endeavored to define the technique of simultaneous interpretation as a means of eliminating the language difficulties on the international forum. In this respect, with the qualifications formulated in the introductory note, I share the view advocated by Mortimer Graves[8] that 'the basic form of language is speech' and that the spoken word can do more toward promoting a better relationship between peoples than anything written or printed.

While discarding the possibility of currently establishing or adopting a sole international language (an existing or non existing tongue, or a 'Basic' variety of the former), Mr. Graves points out—as the only expedient solution—the desirability of each and every one becoming a language student. He adduces excellent proof of the absurdity of at least two widespread superstitions: 1. that only a few highly favored individuals (or nationalities, such as Belgians or Russians) are gifted with a special linguistic sense, and 2. that some languages (such as Chinese) are fantastically difficult. In fact, every single person has succeeded in learning his or her mother tongue, and 450 million Chinese are by no means cleverer than anybody else.

According to Mr. Graves one of the aims of an improved language teaching should be the re-creation of the natural facility with which we were all born and which frequently is atrophied; this refers also to the ability of reproducing foreign sounds, which requires nothing but imitation and practice. The main problem in this connection appears to be the finding of a device by means of which it were possible to free people from the inhibitions contracted in their teens.

Thus, pending the time when members of international organizations will be in the happy position of understanding everything that is said in any of the five official languages, the outlook does not seem to be too gloomy for the recruitment of an efficient linguistic staff.

[8] Mortimer Graves, The Language Barrier to International Understanding, *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, March 1947, 12-6.

THOMAS H. BENTON'S ANALYSIS OF HIS AUDIENCE

Thomas R. Lewis

THIS article reports in brief an audience analysis study which involved a close examination of the senatorial speeches of Thomas H. Benton asking for a reform of the United States currency system and a denial of a new charter for the Second United States Bank; a reconstruction of the social situation in which he spoke; and, through a comparison of the two examinations, an evaluation of Benton's effort to know and appeal to his audience. The senatorial speeches were made between the years 1830 and 1838 to members of the 21st—25th Congresses inclusive. The changing membership of the Senate made the task of analyzing the various attitudes difficult, but not impossible. The analysis of the national audience was made in respect to broad groupings, such as would have been possible for the speaker himself to have done.

The Senatorial Audience

Party alignments and previously held attitudes on the banking and currency issues presented the formula for determining the Senate audience opinion. The shades of opinion varied widely within the party ranks at that period. The National-Republicans, Whigs, and Federalists could be grouped together fairly well, but within the Democratic rank, there was no easy grouping. Two broad groupings were possible: the Whigs, under the leadership of Henry Clay; the Jackson Democrats, the Administration party.[1] In the twenty-first Congress, the first with which this study is concerned, the Clay party and the Jackson party were about of equal strength.

In respect to the first group, Benton could have had little chance of successful appeal either with his fight against the Second Bank of the United States, or with the promotion of his plan for hard-money. Whig interests were not directed towards either the economic or political independence of the mass of the population and certainly not towards social independence;[2] theirs was a class philosophy based upon an aristocracy of the rich and well-born. This was the basic philosophy of Alexander Hamilton—this, the philosophy re-echoed by Webster in his Massachusetts Convention speech of 1820—this, the philosophy of Henry Clay in his popularized American system—and this, the philosophy of John Marshall as he attempted to entrench and preserve the advantages of wealth from an assault by the masses. Thus, to say that Benton felt that he could change the minds and votes of men like Webster, Clay, Silsbee, Clayton, Frelinghuysen, or Ewing on the bank or currency issue would be a fantastic assumption.

Benton's purpose in speaking to the Whig group was to get them to state their position. Of this purpose he wrote in the *Thirty Years' View*:

> The current was all setting one way. I determined to raise a voice against it in the Senate, and made several efforts before I succeeded. . . .[3]

A further indication that Benton had sized up the plans of the opposition and

THOMAS R. LEWIS *is Associate Professor of Speech at Florida State University.*

[1] See *Biographical Dictionary of the American Congress*, 21st Congress.

[2] R. G. Gettell, *History of Political Thought* (New York, 1924) 302.

[3] Thomas H. Benton, *Thirty Years' View* (New York, 1856) 1.187.

was setting his own course to meet their strategy was evident from his statement:

> I foresaw that, if this course was followed, the Bank would triumph without a contest—that she would wait until a majority was installed in both houses of Congress—then present her application—hear a few barren speechs in opposition;—and then gallop the renewed charter through.[4]

As Benton said, it took 'hard knocks to force the issue into the open.'

Benton spoke to the Jackson Democrats in the Senate with the clearcut purpose of gaining support for the Administration's proposals. Two basically antagonistic groups were uniting to make war on the United States Bank: the Western wing of the Democratic party in seeking political democracy objected neither to paper money nor to banks if they were under state control; and the Eastern wing in seeking economic democracy—a just division of the products of labor—was opposed to the whole principle of currency and banking as then in operation.[5] The Western wing, however, was not yet ready for the complex economic program soon to be proposed and pushed for acceptance by the administration. The condemnation of paper money in the Jeffersonian tradition was held as an ideal by a relatively small group of men close to the administration of Andrew Jackson.[6] The members of the group came from East, South, and West; this hard money revolution was not sectional. The size of the movement, still small, showed that a long fight lay ahead before all the steps of the program could be achieved.

That a difficult task confronted Benton and his colleagues may be seen from a statement made by Robert J. Walker, Senator from Mississippi:

> God save us from the wild, visionary, ruinous, and impracticable schemes of the Senator of Missouri . . Sir, in resistance to the power of the Bank of the United States, in opposition to the establishment of any similar institution, the Senator from Missouri would find me with him; but I cannot enlist as a recruit in this new crusade against the banks of my own and every other State in the Union. . . .[7]

In 1840 this same Walker, however, now a strong hard-money man, said of the origin of his new-found philosophy:

> The workingmen of the city of New York, next, perhaps to the patriot Jackson and the Senator from Missouri, may be justly considered the original Loco Focos and hard-money men of the Union.[8]

Because of men like Walker the full campaign against paper money had to be waged carefully. Benton explained the situation thus:

> Though strong in the confidence of the people, the President was not deemed strong enough to encounter all the banks of all the states at once. Temporizing was indispensable—and even a conciliation of a part of them.[9]

With the Bank out of the way, the Administration supporters could plan for a gold currency and a government treasury unconnected with any bank.[10] The Missouri Senator's first speech on the Bank issue set the tone of the coming hard-money program:

> Gold and silver is the best currency for a republic; it suits the men of middle property and the working people best; and if I was going to establish a workingman's party, it should be on the basis of hard-money;—a hard money party, against a paper party.[11]

Nevertheless, Benton recognized that he had to proceed slowly with his movement against all non-specie as currency. That he did this was partially revealed

[4] Ibid.

[5] Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., *The Age of Jackson* (Boston, 1946) 79.

[6] Only five men in the Senate—Benton, Linn, Morris, Ruggles, and Wright—voted against rescinding the Specie Circular.

[7] *Register of Debates*, 24th Congress, 2nd Sess., January 28, 1837, Part 1, 8.622.

[8] *Congressional Globe*, 26th Cong., 1st Sess., January 21, 1840, Vol. 8, Appendix, 140.

[9] Benton, 1.158.

[10] Ibid.

[11] *Register of Debates*, 21st Cong., 1st Sess., February 2, 1831, 8.74-5.

by what he didn't say; he was careful in his movement towards the elimination of small notes altogether and towards complete specie backing for large notes.[12]

With respect to those members of the Senate who were wavering between their loyalty to Jackson's administration and the desire to see the Bank continued as the chief fiscal agent of the government, Benton could crack the party whip. If the sentiment in the country could be aroused against the Bank, this threat could be especially effective. That he appealed to those who dared not go against Jackson's wishes is evident in many of his speeches but a selection from his remarks sustaining the veto of the recharter bill furnishes an excellent example:

> Mr. Benton addresses himself to the Jackson men, present and absent. They might continue to be for a bank and for Jackson; but they could not be for this bank, and for Jackson.[13]

That such appeals were effective is difficult to prove because no member would admit of voting a certain way because of party pressure.

For any of those who might not have recognized the wedding between the Bank and Federalism, Benton made the connection clear. Again we cannot measure the effect of the appeal but we do know that Benton made an attempt to get Southern support by explaining the tie-up of the Bank with Federalism as expressed in the American system.

In spite of the preceding analysis of the Senate audience with a view to determining the possible avenues for appeal by one conducting a fight on the United States Bank and proposing that metallic currency become the current money of the nation, it is probable that opportunity for effective appeal was rather limited. This idea rests upon the belief that most of the Senators had already formed rather set opinons on an issue so large—opinions set long before the debates on the measures took place, particularly in the case of the bank issue.[14] As proof of the set opinion on the recharter issue, we need only look at the vote on Benton's first resolution against the Bank, taken on February 2, 1831, and compare that vote with the one taken on the bill to recharter on June 9, 1832. For all the speech making occurring between these two votes, there was only one shift in the voting as far as members who were present on both occasions were concerned and that one shift could easily be explained on grounds other than a shift of opinion concerning the advisability of bank or no bank.[15] Evidence that Benton did not believe he had much chance to change votes on the bank bill comes from his own words given in his final speech against the recharter of the bank. The congressional reporter wrote:

> He expressed the anxiety he had felt to bring the public mind to bear on the subject: for he did not speak with a view to change the opinions of any Senator, but merely to go abroad to the people.[16]

There is little reason to believe that this was a veiled threat to cause members to change their votes. Benton had no doubt that the measure would ultimately pass: he said:

> Seeing the state of the parties in Congress, and the tactics of the bank— . . . our course of action became obvious, which was—to attack incessantly, assail at all points, display the evil of the institution, arouse the people—and prepare them to sustain the veto.[17]

I believe that Benton's statement was

[12] Thomas R. Lewis, Persuasive Techniques of Thomas Hart Benton as a Congressional Debater. Doctoral dissertation, State University of Iowa, 1948.

[13] Benton, 1.262.

[14] Jackson had questioned the constitutionality and expediency of rechartering the Bank in his first message of 1829, and both friends and enemies had conducted a campaign to engender attack or support long before the measures came up for debate in Congress.

[15] Lewis, 155.

[16] *Register of Debates*, 22nd Cong., 1st Sess., June 9, 1832, Part 1, Vol. 8, 1067.

[17] Benton, 1.238.

honestly made and that the appeal of the speech was primarily to the people.

The evidence seems to indicate that although the possibility for doing a great deal with the immediate audience was rather limited, Benton did analyze possible elements of the audience to which he could speak with a purpose. This belief is substantiated by: 1. Benton's admission of his limitation of appeal; 2. the course chosen for the development of the attack in (a) beginning the debate early to force the issue into the open, (b) soft-pedaling the attack upon all loose banking systems at the beginning of the debate; 3. his appeals to (a) those who were inclined to dislike the centralizing tendency of the United States Bank, (b) those who were inclined towards the Bank but against a high tariff, and (c) those who might waver in their support of the party.

The National Audience

The debate stopped with the single speech; but it was a speech to be read by the people—the masses—the millions; and was conceived and delivered for that purpose; . . .[18]

Thus Benton described his first speech against the Bank and the description shows that he knew where his main opportunity of appeal lay. He made his purpose of taking his appeal to the people even clearer when he said:

My mind was fixed upon the character of the speech which I should make— . . . and take up the institution in a practical sense, as having too much power over the people and the government . . . and too much disposed to exercise that power to the prejudice of the freedom and equality which should prevail in a Republic. . . .[19]

A review of the history of the period reveals at least five influences which were working against the Bank: 1. the widespread belief, in most Southern and Western states, that the institution was in existence by virtue of an unconstitutional act of Congress, 2. a belief, particularly strong in the South, that the Bank was a centralizing force which infringed on the rights of states, 3. a belief held by state banks, again primarily in the South and West, that a national bank was detrimental to their best interests, 4. the belief of a large group, mainly located in the West, that the Bank could not but be opposed to their views of political equality, and 5. the belief by the debtor class that the Bank was an agent to keep them poor and add to the wealth of the rich by exploiting the labor of workers.[20] All these were powerful forces;[21] the last group was perhaps the strongest in numbers because it recruited from all the Eastern industrial workers as well as from the small farming class of the whole country. The last group, too, was the one to which Benton could go for support on the hard-money program.

The constitutional arguments against the Bank were held valid by groups in all Western and Southern states, particularly in Virginia, Georgia, Kentucky, South Carolina, and Tennessee. The main argument involved the necessity of the institution for government fiscal arrangements. As late as 1828 the South Carolina legislature was the recipient of resolutions stating that the Bank was unconstitutional.[22] Benton denied in his speech sustaining the veto that Congress had ever given judgment in favor of branch banking and that the exclusive privileges of the Bank charter violated the principles of the Constitution by benefitting a favored class at the expense of the majority. Moreover, the Bank in using a circulating medium not backed by gold and silver violated the Constitution because Congress could not reg-

[18] Ibid., 204.
[19] Ibid.
[20] Ralph C. H. Catterall, *The Second Bank of the United States* (Chicago, 1903) 164.
[21] J. B. McMaster, *A History of the People of the United States* (New York, 1906) 6.1.
[22] William G. Sumner, *Andrew Jackson as a Public Man* (Boston, 1899) 283.

ulate the value of such currency.[23] Benton, then, made an appeal to the large group in the country who were not willing to accept as final the Supreme Court's opinions in the cases of McCulloch v. Maryland and Osborn v. Bank.

Connected closely with the constitutional question was the hostility of the states towards encroachment on their domain. The constitutions of Illinois and Indiana, for example, forbade a bank to do business within the state unless chartered by the legislature. And many states had attempted to levy taxes against the branches of the United States Bank with a view to controlling, if not to destroying, the power of the mother bank in Philadelphia. These laws were, of course, ruled unconstitutional by the Supreme Court but the feeling of resentment against the Bank was not downed thereby. This feeling of many states' rights adherents opened up a great opportunity for Benton to make a successful appeal against recharter. If the Missouri Senator could connect the Bank with the whole plan of centralism, he would be expressing what many had already felt and believed.

Benton did play hard on this fear of centralism during his speeches against the recharter of the Bank.[24] He declared that the creation of a central moneyed power with ramifications in all the states was a beginning of concentration of political power in the hands of the Federal Government. In the 1830s such pleas had great power, particularly in the South where a slave-holding interest was on the alert 'lest some precedent be established that might tend to provoke national interference with that institution.'[25]

Benton also appealed to the state banking interests. This appeal might seem unusual, since he was no more in favor of existing methods of most state banks than he was of the National Bank and its branches. For the time being, however, it was expedient to make an appeal for the support of the state banks.[26] When the debates in Congress were no longer upon the matter of recharter but upon the matter of instituting gold and silver in the place of bank notes as the national currency, Benton was as severe towards the methods of the state banks as he had been towards the Bank of the United States. In January 1837, he said:

> I did not join in putting down the Bank of the United States to put up a Wilderness of local banks. . . . I did not strike Caesar to make Anthony master of Rome.[27]

A further possibility of appeal lay in the desire of many people for strict adherence to democratic principle, political and social. The principle of political equality was deeply embedded in the philosophy of those who were followers of the Jeffersonian tradition.[28] Nowhere in the country was this feeling stronger than in the West, among the people who had sent Jackson to the Presidency and Benton to the Senate. They felt that the masses, rather than the classes, should be in control of the government. The Missouri Senator pleaded with great emphasis that such a privileged monopoly as the Second Bank could not be prevented from creating a political force

[23] *Register of Debates*, 22nd Cong., 1st Sess., March 21, 1834, Part 1, 8.1073.

[24] Benton's best arguments on this score were given in his speech on 'Removal of Deposits,' January 2-7, 1834. Last third of the speech available only in Library of Congress.

[25] A. Barton Hepburn, *History of Coinage and Currency in the United States* (New York, 1903) 113.

[26] R. C. H. Catterall, author of *The Second National Bank of the United States*, believed that the opponents of the state banks were a powerful influence operating against the recharter of the Second National Bank.

[27] *Register of Debates*, 24th Cong., 2nd Sess., January 27, 1837, Part 1, 8.610-11.

[28] Gettell, 364.

which, if permitted, would strangle all other elements of society. 'The government itself ceases to be independent—it ceases to be safe—when the national currency is at the will of a company' was the ringing theme of many of his speeches. It was to Benton's advantage, and he saw it, to show how Biddle's Bank, the Second National Bank, controlled elections, unethically loaned money to Congressmen, and fought the people's choice, Andrew Jackson.

Closely allied to the group which demanded political equality was the group which feared economic domination by the rich—a group which held that forces were operating within and without the government to make the rich richer and the poor poorer. The appeal in this case was potent throughout the country but particularly in the industrial sections of the East.[29] The group which feared wealth was the one which was willing to go the whole way in economic reform as suggested by the Jackson clique.[30] The working class willingly accepted the arguments that said the destruction of the United States Bank was only one step in the process of reform: that the state banking systems must be reformed so as to embody the hard-money ideals. Benton explained that the new economy would be of greater benefit to the workingman because it proposed moderation of the business cycle and safeguarded him from the unregulated paper issue of currency.[31]

Webster and others saw the true basis of the attack in its condemnation of the long continued control of the government by the property owning classes. In his attack on the veto message, Webster accused the Jackson group of attacking whole classes of people with the purpose of turning the prejudices and resentments of other classes of people against them.[32] And De Tocqueville, the French historian, traveling in the United States at the time, noted that 'the well-informed classes rallied round the bank, the common people round the president.'[33] Benton, however, was more accurate in his description of the class grouping. He contended, popularly with the workers, that it was the great 'business community' comprised of 'wealth, ability, and education' which supported the Bank. He could find few words too strong for use while arguing that the whole financial oligarchy operated to the contrary of the good of the most of the people.[34] That Benton knew the strength of the appeal that the Bank favored one class of the community over another is indicated by the times that argument appeared in his speeches. As an example, he said:

> The temptation is too great—the opportunity too easy—to put up and put down prices; to make and break fortunes; to bring the whole community upon its knees to the Neptunes who preside over the flux and reflux of paper.[35]

Benton also made a strong plea to the West and Southwest that the whole country was falling under the financial domination of the East. The Missouri Senator stressed the arguments that the high protective tariffs appeared to benefit one section of the country at the expense of the others; that the hard money, gold and silver, left the Western and Southern states to find its way to the Eastern banks, and that the farmers were forced

[29] Ibid.

[30] The Workingman's Party was organized in Philadelphia in 1828, and the union movement in the country was getting well under way. See: Fremont P. Wirth, *The Development of America* (Chicago, 1940) 452.

[31] *Congressional Globe*, 25th Cong., 2nd Sess., 1838, 6.223.

[32] *Register of Debates*, 22nd Cong., 1st Sess., June 11, 1832, Part 1, 8.1240.

[33] Benton, 1.226.

[34] Ibid., 228.

[35] *Register of Debates*, 23rd Cong., 1st Sess., March 21, 1834, Part 1, 10.1092-3.

to pay high discount rates when they marketed their crops. His purpose was to show the connection between the recognized problems of the sections and the complex problem of banking and currency which he proposed to reform.

Finally, there were personal prejudices within the country, some quite widespread, to which Benton could and did appeal successfully. An example is that of the prejudice against foreign ownership of property in the United States. This was not a vital argument against the Bank but Benton used it because it would receive acclaim. Another example is the effort he spent to vindicate Jackson through the expunging resolution. The resolution, a small and unimportant matter, actually, through Benton's efforts, became a national issue.

Any conclusions drawn concerning Benton's speaking in the Senate as it related to the national audience would have to admit that he had considered the effects of certain arguments upon that audience; that he was able to recognize and make articulate the wishes of the masses. As one of the prime leaders in that great social force called Jacksonian democracy which was attempting to control monopolistic and undemocratic corporate enterprise, Benton sought and found his support in the masses who believed in political, economic, and social equality.

Summary

This survey reveals that not only did Benton make an analysis of his audiences, the Senate audience and the national audience, but also that his analysis was a sound one. The first conclusion is based upon a comparison of the social scene with the issues discussed by Benton in the course of his speeches; the second, upon results obtained. To say that he gauged the nation's pulse so accurately that he was able thereby to change the course of historical events would be presumptuous. However, Benton saw as clearly as any man in the country that the tides were shifting away from the old Federalistic principles. Perhaps any man in a prominent political position who recognized this rising revolution and agreed with the logic of the change would have entered the center of the current and helped make articulate the vague desires of the social forces in operation. Benton did.

Benton and his colleagues were successful in securing favorable audience reaction to their proposals on banking and currency problems. The charter of the Bank of the United States was not renewed, a sounder specie basis was established for the paper currency, the expunging of the Senate declaration against Jackson was completed, and the divorce of bank and state became a reality. Benton was successful with his Missouri electorate too. The Missouri legislature, by legal enactment, removed the state funds from the National Bank seven months before Jackson took the similar step with regard to national funds; and the Bank of Missouri established in 1837 was made a specie-paying bank and could issue no notes of less than ten dollars denomination.

For a Senator and his colleagues to face in legislative battle the triumvirate of Webster, Clay, and Calhoun and their powerful support was a tribute to moral courage; for them to win their case before the electorate showed astute audience analysis as well as sound development of issues and arguments.

DR. JAMES RUSH—PSYCHOLOGIST AND VOICE SCIENTIST

Lester L. Hale

DR. JAMES RUSH made important contributions to the body of knowledge of our era; his work deserves accurate evaluation and reasonable recognition. Most advanced students of speech have heard his name, but many associate it only with his treatise, *The Philosophy of the Human Voice*[1] and are not aware of the true significance of his life's labor.[2] Few appreciate (1) the approach underlying his philosophy of voice, (2) his primary and basic postulates, (3) his major original contributions to the field of speech. This article attempts to state these points, and to point out his important position as an early American investigator in the science of voice.

1

In the first place, it should be remembered that Dr. James Rush was not a teacher of speech. He was a *physician*, and the son of a physician. In fact, his father, Dr. Benjamin Rush, a signer of the Declaration of Independence and one-time Surgeon General of Washington's army, was the famous physician for whom the Rush Medical School in Chicago was named.[3] His father endowed him with an honest, scientific curiosity, and apparently encouraged him in his study of medicine. James became a reputable physician, a fact which is borne out in many personal letters of testimony.[4]

During James Rush's practice of medicine he became especially interested in the controlling powers of *mind* and began making specific observations and investigations of the phenomenon of thought. In 1813 he lectured on *mind* to his father's classes at the medical school at the University of Pennsylvania. The essence of his early teaching was that 'reasoning is only a train of physical perception,' and that 'mind in its outline consisted only of perception and memory; . . . this view seemed to be the basis of the general phenomena of think-

LESTER L. HALE *is Associate Professor of Speech and Director of the Speech and Hearing Clinic at the University of Florida.*

[1] James Rush, *The Philosophy of the Human Voice: Embracing Its Physiological History; Together With a System of Principles, by Which Criticism in the Art of Elocution May Be Rendered Intelligible, and Instruction, Definite and Comprehensive. To Which is Added a Brief Analysis of Song and Recitative* (Philadelphia, 1827). Cited hereafter as the *Philosophy*.

[2] For the reader's convenience, the publications of Rush are listed below in chronological order:

1827, *The Philosophy of the Human Voice*, 1st edition.
1833, *Philosophy*, 2nd edition (a revision).
1834, *Hamlet, A Dramatic Prelude in Five Acts* (a play).
1845, *Philosophy*, 3rd edition (a revision).
1855, *Philosophy*, 4th edition (a revision).
1859, *Philosophy*, 5th edition (a revision).
1865, *A Brief Outline of an Analysis of the Human Intellect* (begun in 1818).
1867, *Philosophy*, 6th edition (a minor revision).
1869, *Rhymes of Contrast on Wisdom and Folly*.
1879, *Philosophy*, 7th edition (a reprint).

[3] Biographers differ on the date of James Rush's birth; some say March 1, and others March 15, of 1786. However, the family tree and tombstone give March 15 as the date of James' birth; his brother, John, was born on March 1.

[4] Lester L. Hale, A Re-Evaluation of the Vocal Philosophy of Dr. James Rush as Based on a Study of His Sources, unpublished doctoral dissertation (Louisiana State University, 1942). Dr. James Rush willed the major portion of his sizeable estate to the Library Company of Philadelphia for the creation of the Ridgeway Branch, named for his deceased wife, Anne Ridgeway. In it is housed his own personal collection of books, manuscripts, and correspondence as well as that of his father. Much of the continuing research on Rush being done by this investigator is based on a study of this material.

ing.'[5] These observations, with modifications, were put in unpublished notation under date of 1818.[6]

By 1823, however, Rush stopped writing on *mind* and it was not until 1865 that he published *An Analysis of the Human Intellect*.[7] This delay was occasioned by at least five circumstances. The first of these was his desire to acquire 'further knowledge of the various departments of nature, science, art and life.'[8] In order to make more objective observations on *mind* he sensed a need to acquaint himself in greater detail with areas in which it functioned. In further study of this phenomenon he found it involved not only perception and memory, but the manner in which mind was capable of expression.

Secondly, then, this led him to the realization that one of the outstanding agents of expression was the voice. In order to observe the function of *mind* it became necessary to record vocal behavior carefully. As will be later seen, this constituted the main reason for his detailed concern with voice and the organization of his observations into *The Philosophy of the Human Voice*.

His third reason for delaying publication of his investigations on *mind* was his hesitancy to encroach upon the realm of research dominated at that time by the 'privileged order of metaphysicians.'[9] In that day the popular approach to any study of *mind* was by way of metaphysical speculation. It was generally believed that *mind* was the *spirit*, and the *spirit* was an entity separated from matter and under the control of occult powers. To depart from this general approach, as did Rush, and undertake to describe the function of *mind* as a physiological phenomenon was heresy. Indeed, there was some belief that Rush was an atheistic crackpot because of such contemplations. But Rush believed in a 'First Cause' capable of creating life and its organization in relation to matter. The departure from a position acceptable to his contemporary society was explained by his belief that even though an Almighty Power created initially all life together with an organization of minerals, that 'laws of a full and perfect structure of vegetable and animal life'[10] would in turn yield themselves to human scientific investigation and classification. One of his earliest inventories of *mind* was made in terms of tangible descriptions of functional details; he attempted to show some of the physical ways in which mind controls thought and behavior; he sought to break down the governing agent of human life into discernible parts; and, he was persistent in his acknowledgment that an Almighty God had created all existence and that our scientific investigation of the elements merely aided us in understanding His instruments of life. Rush had pried open the door of scientific investigation of *mind* at a time when public and religious reaction to such an inquiry was intense.

Of lesser significance, but constituting another reason for laying aside his treatise on the human intellect, was his desire to write in the field of medicine itself. He hoped to write a book that would be of a most practical nature and not one which confused fact and fiction. He proposed to call this book 'Novus Ordo Medicinae.'

The detour in reaching his objective, a

[5] James Rush, *A Brief Outline of the Analysis of the Human Intellect* (Philadelphia, 1865) 2-436. Cited hereafter as *Human Intellect*.

[6] Rush made notations in what he called his 'Common Book of Medicine' between the years 1818 and 1822. Reference to this unpublished work as well as excerpts from it may be found in *Human Intellect*, 2-435 ff.

[7] *Human Intellect*, 2 vols.

[8] Ibid., 471.

[9] Ibid., 472.

[10] *Human Intellect*, 1-37.

DR. JAMES RUSH—PSYCHOLOGIST AND VOICE SCIENTIST

Lester L. Hale

DR. JAMES RUSH made important contributions to the body of knowledge of our era; his work deserves accurate evaluation and reasonable recognition. Most advanced students of speech have heard his name, but many associate it only with his treatise, *The Philosophy of the Human Voice*[1] and are not aware of the true significance of his life's labor.[2] Few appreciate (1) the approach underlying his philosophy of voice, (2) his primary and basic postulates, (3) his major original contributions to the field of speech. This article attempts to state these points, and to point out his important position as an early American investigator in the science of voice.

I

In the first place, it should be remembered that Dr. James Rush was not a teacher of speech. He was a *physician*, and the son of a physician. In fact, his father, Dr. Benjamin Rush, a signer of the Declaration of Independence and one-time Surgeon General of Washington's army, was the famous physician for whom the Rush Medical School in Chicago was named.[3] His father endowed him with an honest, scientific curiosity, and apparently encouraged him in his study of medicine. James became a reputable physician, a fact which is borne out in many personal letters of testimony.[4]

During James Rush's practice of medicine he became especially interested in the controlling powers of *mind* and began making specific observations and investigations of the phenomenon of thought. In 1813 he lectured on *mind* to his father's classes at the medical school at the University of Pennsylvania. The essence of his early teaching was that 'reasoning is only a train of physical perception,' and that 'mind in its outline consisted only of perception and memory; . . . this view seemed to be the basis of the general phenomena of think-

LESTER L. HALE *is Associate Professor of Speech and Director of the Speech and Hearing Clinic at the University of Florida.*

[1] James Rush, *The Philosophy of the Human Voice: Embracing Its Physiological History; Together With a System of Principles, by Which Criticism in the Art of Elocution May Be Rendered Intelligible, and Instruction, Definite and Comprehensive. To Which is Added a Brief Analysis of Song and Recitative* (Philadelphia, 1827). Cited hereafter as the *Philosophy*.

[2] For the reader's convenience, the publications of Rush are listed below in chronological order:

1827, *The Philosophy of the Human Voice*, 1st edition.

1833, *Philosophy*, 2nd edition (a revision).

1834, *Hamlet, A Dramatic Prelude in Five Acts* (a play).

1845, *Philosophy*, 3rd edition (a revision).

1855, *Philosophy*, 4th edition (a revision).

1859, *Philosophy*, 5th edition (a revision).

1865, *A Brief Outline of an Analysis of the Human Intellect* (begun in 1818).

1867, *Philosophy*, 6th edition (a minor revision).

1869, *Rhymes of Contrast on Wisdom and Folly*.

1879, *Philosophy*, 7th edition (a reprint).

[3] Biographers differ on the date of James Rush's birth; some say March 1, and others March 15, of 1786. However, the family tree and tombstone give March 15 as the date of James' birth; his brother, John, was born on March 1.

[4] Lester L. Hale, A Re-Evaluation of the Vocal Philosophy of Dr. James Rush as Based on a Study of His Sources, unpublished doctoral dissertation (Louisiana State University, 1942). Dr. James Rush willed the major portion of his sizeable estate to the Library Company of Philadelphia for the creation of the Ridgeway Branch, named for his deceased wife, Anne Ridgeway. In it is housed his own personal collection of books, manuscripts, and correspondence as well as that of his father. Much of the continuing research on Rush being done by this investigator is based on a study of this material.

ing.'[5] These observations, with modifications, were put in unpublished notation under date of 1818.[6]

By 1823, however, Rush stopped writing on *mind* and it was not until 1865 that he published *An Analysis of the Human Intellect*.[7] This delay was occasioned by at least five circumstances. The first of these was his desire to acquire 'further knowledge of the various departments of nature, science, art and life.'[8] In order to make more objective observations on *mind* he sensed a need to acquaint himself in greater detail with areas in which it functioned. In further study of this phenomenon he found it involved not only perception and memory, but the manner in which mind was capable of expression.

Secondly, then, this led him to the realization that one of the outstanding agents of expression was the voice. In order to observe the function of *mind* it became necessary to record vocal behavior carefully. As will be later seen, this constituted the main reason for his detailed concern with voice and the organization of his observations into *The Philosophy of the Human Voice*.

His third reason for delaying publication of his investigations on *mind* was his hesitancy to encroach upon the realm of research dominated at that time by the 'privileged order of metaphysicians.'[9] In that day the popular approach to any study of *mind* was by way of metaphysical speculation. It was generally believed that *mind* was the *spirit*, and the *spirit* was an entity separated from matter and under the control of occult powers. To depart from this general approach, as did Rush, and undertake to describe the function of *mind* as a physiological phenomenon was heresy. Indeed, there was some belief that Rush was an atheistic crackpot because of such contemplations. But Rush believed in a 'First Cause' capable of creating life and its organization in relation to matter. The departure from a position acceptable to his contemporary society was explained by his belief that even though an Almighty Power created initially all life together with an organization of minerals, that 'laws of a full and perfect structure of vegetable and animal life'[10] would in turn yield themselves to human scientific investigation and classification. One of his earliest inventories of *mind* was made in terms of tangible descriptions of functional details; he attempted to show some of the physical ways in which mind controls thought and behavior; he sought to break down the governing agent of human life into discernible parts; and, he was persistent in his acknowledgment that an Almighty God had created all existence and that our scientific investigation of the elements merely aided us in understanding His instruments of life. Rush had pried open the door of scientific investigation of *mind* at a time when public and religious reaction to such an inquiry was intense.

Of lesser significance, but constituting another reason for laying aside his treatise on the human intellect, was his desire to write in the field of medicine itself. He hoped to write a book that would be of a most practical nature and not one which confused fact and fiction. He proposed to call this book 'Novus Ordo Medicinae.'

The detour in reaching his objective, a

[5] James Rush, *A Brief Outline of the Analysis of the Human Intellect* (Philadelphia, 1865) 2.436. Cited hereafter as *Human Intellect*.

[6] Rush made notations in what he called his 'Common Book of Medicine' between the years 1818 and 1822. Reference to this unpublished work as well as excerpts from it may be found in *Human Intellect*, 2.435 ff.

[7] *Human Intellect*, 2 vols.

[8] Ibid., 471.

[9] Ibid., 472.

[10] *Human Intellect*, 1.37.

rationale of *mind,* was finally occasioned by his effort to court social approval of his authority. He reasoned that neither a text in medicine nor a professional dissertation on *mind* would be accepted by the hostile public until he had received acclaim through the medium of other publications more readily understandable and easily appreciated. This sensitivity no doubt intensified his determination first to complete the *Philosophy.*

When the *Philosophy of the Human Voice* was published in 1827, it was heralded by several teachers such as Jonathan Barber as an unprecedented triumph. The association and friendship which developed between Rush and Barber became a source of encouragement to Rush and contributed to his feeling that the *Philosophy* would be most popular.[11] Rush even anticipated its becoming a monumental work. The publication in 1834 of *Hamlet, A Dramatic Prelude in Five Acts,*[12] was a further attempt to receive favor through the writing of fiction. He hoped that by showing his ability to produce non-factual material he could command greater respect for his scientific reporting.

Only after examination of these reasons for the later publication (in 1865) of Rush's efforts to fathom the function of *mind* can one discern the underlying approach this physician made to a treatise in the field of speech.

[11] Jonathan Barber wrote in 1823, *Exercises in Reading and Recitation* (Baltimore). He and Rush were drawn to each other because of their identical points of view. Barber had migrated from England to Philadelphia where he taught elocution. He was the first to read and understand Rush's text, and three weeks after its publication gave public lectures in Musical Fund Hall of Philadelphia to illustrate the nature and uses of the work. Rush considered Jonathan Barber the maker of the early fortune of the *Philosophy.*

[12] James Rush, *Hamlet, A Dramatic Prelude in Five Acts* (Philadelphia, 1834).

2

The hybrid process of reasoning and experimentation made the investigations of Rush an interesting cross between the armchair psychology of his contemporaries and the experimental psychology which followed almost half a century later. It should be remembered that his 1818 recorded notations were contemporary with Bessel's report of the Greenwich observatory incident which called attention to individual differences and ushered in a new era in psychology. Thus, his primary postulates on mind and voice become historically significant in the field of psychology as well as speech.

Rush's first concern, then, was with the *functioning of mind,* and his first major contention was that mind should be regarded as a physiological function as orderly as sensation itself and as tangible as muscle movement. His two volumes on the subject of the human intellect are too involved and cumbersome to be reported upon in detail, but it can be seen that he started from a premise of sound physiologic reality.

> All that man perceives, thinks, pronounces, and performs is respectively through his senses, his brain, and his muscles. From these physical and directive agencies proceed his science and his art; and from their proper or improper use severally arise his good and his evil, his error and his truth.[13]

He proceeds to break the function of mind into five 'constituents.' These are:

> First, primary perceptions of things before the senses. Second, memorial perceptions after their removal. Third, joint perceptions; by which primary are compared with primary, or memorial with memorials which are called unmixed; and mixed, when these two different forms are compared with each other. Fourth, conclusive perceptions, or those by which we come finally to a knowledge of the relationships of two or more of the primary and memorial to each other; from their agreement or identity to classify the things of nature; affirm their laws;

[13] *Human Intellect,* 1.9.

and apply them to the purpose of science, of art, and of our physical, moral and intellectual selves. Fifth, verbal perceptions, or vocal and written signs of all the other four different forms; without which allotted and manageable signs; or in common phrase, without language of sound, or of symbol, for thought, and passion; the human mind would be as limited as that of the brute.[14]

What Rush was saying simply meant that the complicated and mysterious functioning of mind was really an orderly sequence of sensation, memory, association, conclusive perception, and muscular and verbal performance responses.

All its [mind's] intellectual functions and products, whether of thought, or passion, properly so distinguished; or of passion carried into nervous, muscular, or vocal action, are the effects, the whole effects, and nothing but the effects of these.[15]

His effort as a physician-scientist to understand mind as a physiological phenomenon—a function of tangible matter and human material—was one of the earliest beginnings of modern classifications in psychology. It was no doubt a forerunner of physiological psychology.

Secondly, he insisted that the function of mind was not complete until it had evidenced itself in some form of expression.

The mind as we only can know it; is an indivisible compound of Thought and Speech or other sign. Which first begins, if they are not co-eval, is a point for Metaphysicians. We know that without mind, there would be no significant indication of it; and without speech or other sign of the mind, there would be no knowledge of its existence: or if known as a germ, it could not without language, be capable of self growth or expansion. With a joint agency, however, they give to man, all his power, beyond that of the brute, of greater muscular strength than his own. To describe the mind, therefore, it is necessary to show the inseparable connection between thought and the voice; with their influences on each other: for they cannot, separately, be fully known.[16]

Rush spent nearly forty years developing his concept of the verbal expression, verbal sign (the fifth constituent of mind), before completing his general study of mind.[17]

In pointing out the interdependence of thought and speech, and in demonstrating the functions of mind to be a physiological phenomenon, the third basic postulate becomes evident—that speech is part and parcel of a total mental and physical response. Although in both his books he stops the moving wheel to count its spokes, he remains constantly aware of man's dynamic nature, his integration, his existence as a unit, and his whole personality. 'Wisdom, folly, virtue, and vice, with all their forms and effects are enacted by the mind,'[18] he says, and what a person is, and what he will be, is determined by the cultivated use of sensation, memory, association, and the verbal resultant. Mental processes, then, are one and the same with physical sensation and expression; and, speech cannot be isolated or disassociated from the physical being, or whole personality, for it is actually the fifth constituent of mind itself. These tenets of Rush remind one of current opinion in psychology and speech. In fact, the major philosophy of Charles Henry Woolbert, whose writings and teachings continue to influence our modern methodology was not unlike this point of view. In the preface to the first edition of his *Fundamentals of Speech*, Woolbert says:

[14] Ibid., 195 (Beginning with the fourth edition, 1855, of the *Philosophy*, Rush attempted to introduce the double comma as a punctuation mark to be of value between a single comma and a semi-colon).

[15] Ibid., 189.

[16] Ibid., 4.

[17] In a footnote Rush says that the *Philosophy of the Human Voice* would have been more properly called, the *Philosophy of the Verbal Sign of the Intellect. Human Intellect*, 1.190.

[18] *Human Intellect*, 2.1.

> With this end in view it [his textbook] aims to offer speech-training for the whole man: body, voice, and mental mechanism. It is frankly psychological in foundation, and of psychologies is outspokenly behavioristic—that is to say, it insists that speech is a matter of the whole man, the cooperative activity of the entire organism; that it is a revelation of personality, but that the true definition of personality gives a picture compounded of thinking apparatus, emotional machinery, muscular activity, and body-wide participating parts—voice, brain, muscles, trunk, and limbs.[19]

Fourthly, in recording his *Philosophy of the Human Voice*, Rush endeavored to furnish 'physiological data to Rhetoricians.'[20] It was not his concern to create a system of rules, but to observe nature that he might give a physiological foundation to expressive art.

> Although I have gone deeply into the philosophical analysis if speech, and have spared no pains or detail in illustrating whatever might otherwise be obscure from its novelty; I have not pretended to make specific application of the principles of intonation, to all styles of reading and speaking voice. This assumption of the discipline and practice of the habitual teacher, is beyond my design.[21]

The anatomy of the speech mechanism had already been described by science, but the physiology or function of the mechanism had not been detailed beyond discernment of the parts of the system that produced the sound. Rhetoricians, on the other hand, had noted the elements of voice—force, pitch, quality, etc.,—but had not identified them with the functions of the anatomy. In publishing a vocal philosophy which gave a physiological foundation and explanation to vocal theory, Rush gave an entirely new and different emphasis to the study and teaching of speech.[22]

His last postulate has to do with the application he believed could be made of his organized arrangement and description of the vocal elements. Rush insisted that the natural phenomena of vocal expression were describable, and further, that only from such a description could students be guided in making their own analysis of nature. He believed that an actor's or speaker's first obligation was to nature, that to be natural in all expression was the prime prerequisite, but that a student must have the cues to recognition of nature's unfoldment which a study of the *Philosophy* should give him. Furthermore, when the dictates of nature inspire a performer he must have at his command the skill of a voice potential which will serve his creative instinct. That potential can be cultivated by exercise of the voice, unrelated to any specific performance effort. He reasoned that as a violinist must learn finger dexterity and tonal control through exercise, so should a vocalist, speaker, or singer, achieve vocal capacity that would serve him satisfactorily in moments of creative expression.

Having explained how Dr. Rush came to write in the field of speech and what major premises formed the foundation of his various writings, we are now in position to examine the original contributions he made specifically in the field of speech.

3

The greater part of the *Philosophy of the Human Voice* consists of adaptation of principles found in other books by Rush's contemporaries and predecessors. It was his adaptation and treatment of these that was new. He acknowledged that most of the elements he treated were universally known, and in some cases already were developed carefully. But there were several outstanding

[19] Charles Henry Woolbert, *The Fundamentals of Speech* (New York, 1920) i-ii.

[20] Rush's marginal notation in his personal copy of John Walker, *Elements of Elocution* (Boston, 1810) 244.

[21] *Philosophy* (1827) 25.

[22] *Philosophy* (Philadelphia, 1845) 123.

contributions in his book that apparently were products of his own thinking.

This report does not propose to show the influence of these contributions upon the work of later scholars, but there are notable points of comparison between his writings and modern thought. Many ideas usually attributed by recent writers to Rush are not among those regarded by this writer as original with him. For example: *eight qualities of voice* are attributed to Rush by Tressider.

> Most discussions of quality include the classifications of the various types of quality, usually eight, according to the list first made out by Dr. James Rush, an early pioneer in speech work. Deliberate application of those types: *aspirate, guttural, pectoral, nasal, oral, falsetto, normal,* and *orotund,* was of considerably more use to the old student of elocution than it is to modern students of the "natural" method.[23]

Actually, Rush described only four: normal, falsetto, whisper, nasal, and even these were previously mentioned by Cooke, Hastings, Cockin, Mason, and others. Rush claimed no originality here except as to functional details of description. On the other hand, his points of greatest originality are not found as references in modern textbooks. This may be due to the fact that his individual approach and his original view-point were more that of a scientist, in an era when emphasis in teaching was upon oral and dramatic performance. By the time experimental phonetics commanded attention, Rush's pedagogical reputation had already been established and his profound purpose and important contributions forgotten.

There are five major and original contributions of Rush to the field of speech. In the first place, he made a bold gesture at clarifying speech nomenclature. Such confusion had resulted from earlier writers using terms so freely and interchangeably that their concepts themselves were often obscured. Rush attempted to give rhyme and reason to the terms currently being used. For example, he drew together the 'elements.' He classified voice under five general heads: quality, force, time, abruptness, and pitch.[24] Discussion of pitch became more perspicuous under his terminology because he used terms with parallel reference in music. Many other useful gains were achieved in his reordering nomenclature. No doubt the nomenclature described and used in the *Philosophy* was a great influence in developing the speech terminology in use today.

The second, and without doubt the most important original, contribution was his concept of a *radical* and *vanishing* movement in the production of phonetic units. A greater part of his text is based upon this concept. Much of his work on pitch and stress appears to be more original with him than it actually was because of his use of *radical* and *vanish* to explain them. *Radical* is the beginning or *root* of each sound unit from which the *vanish* can develop all manner of movement to complete the unit. This *vanishing* movement has usually a fading effect, although in some cases the *radical* fades into a *stressed vanish*. The simplest illustration of *radical* and *vanish* is the diphthong or receding glide. In vowel movements of the word *day*, Rush refers to the [e] as the *Radical* and the [ɪ] or [j] as the *vanish*. In the approaching glide [j] as in the word *yes*, the *radical* is the [j] and the [ɛ] the *stressed vanish*. There is no definite division of movement into two parts; rather these terms are 'general

[23] Argus Tressider, *Reading to Others* (New York, 1940) 200. A similar quotation can be found in Sarett and Foster, *Basic Principles of Speech* (New York, 1936) 215.

[24] *Philosophy* (1827) 29.

reference to the two extremes of the movement.'[25]

He further points out that when the voice moves through the *radical* and *vanish* in a smooth manner with no effort to prolong either the attack or the release of the sound, the *equable concrete* movement is formed. If the first part of the sound is prolonged and the *vanish* is terminated rapidly, the *protracted radical* is created. Likewise, the *protracted vanish* occurs when the *radical* is slighted but greater stress and duration is given the *vanish*.

Rush's whole approach to vocal analysis through this principle of the *radical* and *vanishing* movement has a very modern flavor. Indeed, present day advocates of dynamic phonetics should find themselves quite at home with this concept.

Much can be explained by *radical* and *vanish*. Differences in stress and loudness occur always between the *radical* and *vanishing* movement. Between the *radical* and *vanish* there must be a difference in pitch. Song is distinguished from speech in that song is characteristically a *monotone*. The pitch differences in song are of melodic nature, but a word or syllable sung on a single melody note is a *monotone*. Rush says there can be no such thing as a *monotone* in speech for there must be a change in pitch sometime during the *radical-vanishing* movement to each syllable. This can certainly be observed when a person speaks in a so-called *monotone*, for the monotonous effect comes from a predominant pitch or pitch pattern, while there are still present the slight pitch changes during each *radical-vanishing* movement. The uses to which this principle can be put in voice training and speech correction are legion. Space will not permit a discussion of these applications here, but a lengthy discourse might be written on Rush's *radical* and *vanish* concept.

The third phase of his orginal work on voice was his explanation of the phonetic elements upon the function of *radical* and *vanish*. He not only reclassified them to avoid the inconsistencies of spelling, but also to observe the intonation of speech. He recognized thirty-five phonetic elements which he divided into three groups: the *tonics, subtonics,* and *atonics*. The *tonics* are capable of complete *radical* and *vanish* movements (vowels, glides); the *subtonics* can embrace this movement within themselves less perfectly, depending usually upon an adjacent tonic for completion (voiced consonants); and the *atonics* are incapable of employing the movement, but serve in the capacity of initiators or terminators (unvoiced consonants). The *tonics* serve best as vehicles of flexibility in intonation, the *subtonics* next best, and the *atonics* are of least value in that respect. He also described the sounds as to aspiration, abruptness and other phonetic characteristics. His was the clearest and most reasonable phonetic analysis of his day and one which is worthy of current consideration.

The fourth vocal principle he projected was his doctrine of syllabication. This again was based upon the *radical* and *vanishing* movement. A syllable depends upon the completion of the *radical* and *vanish*. When that movement has been terminated any new sound produced will of necessity initiate another syllable. The presence of a final *atonic* means that another syllable will of necessity be initiated if it is followed by a *subtonic* or *tonic* which has the capacity to begin a new *radical* and *vanish* movement. Two adjacent *atonics* prolong the syllable, but once the *vanish* is completed by an *atonic* a new movement cannot be begun without a second syllable result-

[25] Ibid., 43.

ing. This concept of the continuing capacity of *subtonics* is in use today in the dynamic phonetic approach some choral directors use to instruct their people to 'sing' voiced consonants. The whole concept of syllabication as based on the *radical* and *vanish* movement can be exceedingly useful in many phases of vocal instruction.

The fifth point of originality in Rush's vocal theory was his detailed description of the specific interval of inflection. He described the emotional and intellectual impressions created by the use of certain intervals of pitch-change in the spoken word. These vary from semi-tone changes in plaintive expression, when the change in pitch is so slight between the *radical* and *vanishing* movement that only the trained ear will recognize it as a varying pitch, to the octave inflection of interrogation and emphasis. He describes the effect of these intervals as they occur in both rising or falling *slides*, in the *circumflex* and in the *step* forms. These variations are so rapid and in some cases so minute that it is difficult to recognize their existence as an important discriminating factor between speech and song. They are responsible, however, for much of the emotion and shades of meaning in speech.

These five phases of his vocal philosophy can be regarded as the most significant and original contributions within his speech text.

4

The Philosophy of the Human Voice was so exhaustive for the time in which it appeared, that it served as a textbook in speech and made Rush an authoritative reference. Unfortunately, while it was widely employed by his immediate followers, the basic philosophy under which he labored became distorted. The *descriptive* analysis resulting from his philosophy and primary postulates came soon to be regarded by his students as a *prescriptive* system easily adapted to the needs of their various methods of vocal instruction, and Dr. James Rush became identified with the elocutionary systems and artifices which predominated the early American teaching in the field of speech.

How succeeding generations drew further and further away from his precepts cannot be told here, but to correct the mistaken identity we must judge Rush on the basis of his entire program of research and not alone upon a superficial view of his work on voice as recorded in the *Philosophy*.

It is easy to pass too hastily over the *title* of his book: *The Philosophy of the Human Voice*. The word *philosophy* was no random choice![26] It embodied the key to his purpose. Rush did not plan a prescriptive system of elocution. His purpose was to show speech to be a part of nature's orderly design; his classification of vocal phenomena which grew out of his classification of mind was a descriptive analysis of the voice potential. He is deserving of greater acclaim than simple identification with an outmoded system of histrionics. Perhaps he should be named in the textbooks of today as one of the important early contributors to the modern concept of speech as the index to total personality. He was a speech psychologist, and probably America's first voice scientist.

[26] The word *Philosophy* in Rush's day signified analysis and scientific investigation of facts and principles of reality and human nature. (Until the late 19th Century *physics* was *natural philosophy*.) Modern tools of science were unknown in his time, and he used the only available instrument of observation of the vocal phenomenon—the human ear. Rather than passing judgment on his descriptions, it would be exceedingly interesting to submit them to modern research to discern how much truth there was in them.

PENTHOUSE PRODUCTION IN THE HIGH SCHOOL

Glenn Hughes

BECAUSE some readers may not be familiar with the word 'Penthouse' as applied to theatrical production, I shall begin by saying that it is synonymous with 'arena.'

Obviously I cannot claim any connection with the origin of arena production, but I can claim connection with the application of this technique to standard modern drama, and certainly I am responsible for the present theatrical significance of the word 'Penthouse.' For seventeen years we have employed at the University of Washington the ancient method of central staging, and our success has been so striking that the idea has spread through the entire country, and even to Europe.

My present purpose is to discuss the adaptability of Penthouse technique to high school play production. First, however, I feel it necessary to provide the reader with some background material in order that he may understand the philosophy which gave rise to our original experiment, and also in order that he may gain a clear conception of the basic principles of Penthouse technique.

1

Back in 1932 I was very unhappy. We were presenting plays in an old-fashioned auditorium on the campus which seated more than two thousand persons, which had a miserable stage, even more miserable acoustics, and which was in every way unpleasant to both audience and actors. Added to this unfavorable situation was the fact that we were in the midst of a depression, and the theatre, like most businesses, was at low ebb. In other words, attendance was poor. Finally, we were facing the bitter fact that the talking picture was such a huge success that most people were losing sight of the legitimate stage. It seemed to me that a person in my position, with a responsibility toward the drama, ought to be able to do something to reawaken public interest in the living actor. So I began to think.

I had noticed, when attending performances of our own, and also those of the professional theatre, that the actors seemed very far-off—except from the first ten or twelve rows. It required an effort of the eyes to distinguish their facial expressions, and an auditory effort to catch their lines. Ten years earlier I had not been aware of this, even though at that time I had frequently sat in the balcony. Something had happened in a decade to bring about this change. And obviously it was the influence of the motion picture. The enlarged image of the actor projects clearly to the back of the house; the amplified record of his voice does likewise. Audiences had become conditioned to the movies, and so, when they attended a legitimate performance, they found the actor weak and ineffectual. The obvious conclusion to be drawn from this observation was that the living actor must be brought closer to his audience. But how? The whole audience cannot sit in the first few rows of the theatre. Then it occurred to me that they could do so if the rows were long enough. But if they were lengthened they would get away from the actor. Not

GLENN HUGHES *is Professor of English and Director of the School of Drama at the University of Washington. He is the author of a book on the American theatre from 1700 to 1950 to be published early next year.*

if they curved around him. There was the clue! Yes, curved around him—as in the circus or the boxing-ring.

2

Approximately twenty-five centuries ago the drama was born in Greece. We are told and we have no reason to doubt that the performers danced and chanted in a circle, with the audience clustered about them on all sides. Later, it is true, a stage-building was erected, and the audience was placed on elevated seats facing this stage-building. The Romans took the plan from the Greeks, and the modern world inherited it from the Romans. But through all the centuries a few actors went on acting in the circle. Most of them were clowns.

In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries various companies of Italian clowns established a tradition which provides one of the most colorful chapters in the history of the theatre—the *commedia dell' arte*. And although the climax of this amazing comedy of masks was played in the gilded court theatres of France, its beginnings were on a platform in the market place, with the public agape on three and sometimes four sides.

In England, at the time of Shakespeare's birth, the little companies of strolling players performed on platforms in the market place or in the courtyards of inns. The first public theatres erected in London were little more than arenas.

The traditional Chinese and the earliest Japanese theatres were like the Elizabethan—platforms thrust out into the audience. Modified arenas, three-quarters of the circle rather than the whole, but still retaining the intimate relation between actor and audience.

The circus has always clung to the circle. It has multiplied it by two or three, but it has never abandoned it. And the one-ring circus is, as to form, the best. The Cirque d'Hiver in Paris, for example. There one sees famous clowns such as the Fratellinis presented as clowns should be presented—in a not-too-large circle, themselves the focal point for a ring of eyes.

Having indulged in these historical reminiscences, I was now ready to apply my findings to the modern problem. My thought ran as follows:

If the comedian has, during many centuries, in several countries, performed successfully in a circle, then why not draw a circle and put him in it? That is, a modern comedian—not a traditional clown. Not Scaramouche, but Jimmie Jones. Yes, but what about scenery? Of course before there were any stage settings the people didn't miss them. Now they're used to them. And how can you put scenery into an arena without cutting off the view of half the audience? You can't. But how important is scenery in the presentation of modern realistic comedy? Who cares about the three canvas walls that surround the actors? Stage settings used to attract more attention because they were a novelty. Nowadays the movies have gone so much farther in realistic backgrounds that legitimate stage settings hold little thrill for the audience. Usually they are tolerated or ignored. If by chance they do attract attention they are apt merely to invite comparison with movie settings, to the disadvantage of the stage. What audiences enjoy in modern comedy is character, story, and dialogue. These three are retained if we move from the proscenium-arch stage to the arena. Therefore we will lose nothing vital, and we will gain much. We will gain (1) novelty of presentation; (2) extreme intimacy between audience and actor; (3) extreme realism of action.

By 'extreme realism' I mean that by placing actors in an arena we eliminate

the most artificial element in the conventional theatre—the proscenium arch, which has long been referred to as the 'fourth wall,' and which for more than two centuries has proved a bugbear to actors and directors of realistic plays. In real life a room has four walls. On the stage it has three. In a real room the action bears in upon itself from four directions. On the stage the action must be projected outward in one direction, through the missing fourth wall. This requirement is not so difficult to meet in the production of old, romantic plays, where the playwrights recognized the presence of the audience and made full use of soliloquies and asides, but in modern realistic plays it creates a paradoxical situation for the actor. He must ignore the audience, even to the extent of turning his back upon it from time to time, but he must still project the play through the proscenium opening. The arrangement of the furniture, too, must be a compromise between reality and theatrical necessity. Pieces which normally would occupy positions along the fourth wall are eliminated or else are placed elsewhere, facing or at right angles to the audience.

On the other hand, when we move into the arena, we arrange furniture naturally, as it would be arranged in a room, and our actors use that furniture naturally, facing in any direction they choose at any time. They are always facing a part of the audience. But how about furniture that would normally stand against a wall? There won't be any wall for it to stand against. True. That is our artificiality. The furniture must all be in the center of the room. But this convention does not affect the naturalness of the actor's movements. He is still playing in a four-sided room. And it is possible in most drawing-room plays to get along without fireplaces and other wall-pieces. The lack of windows sometimes poses a problem, but not an insoluble one. Usually it is simply a matter of having the actor look through a door instead of a window. And there have to be doors leading into the arena. Space does not permit me to go into all the details of arena staging. The main point, however, is that there are in existence a fair number of modern comedies which lend themselves to the Penthouse method of production.

3

By this time the reader, no doubt, is wondering how our arena productions at the University of Washington acquired the name Penthouse. We may as well clear up that point now.

In 1932, when I decided to apply the ancient circus technique to modern plays, I was at a loss to know where to conduct that experiment. I disliked the idea of risking it in a classroom, for I had sense enough to know that a classroom atmosphere can kill almost any idea. And especially a theatrical one. Look what it has done to Shakespeare! Accidentally one day I was chatting with a wealthy friend of mine who had just finished building a penthouse atop a new hotel only two blocks from the campus, and he happened to mention that he had not yet furnished the large living-room of that penthouse. This gave me an idea, and I promptly suggested that he let us use this room for our experiment. He agreed, and a few days later I took several members of my staff up to the penthouse, led them into the bare drawing-room, an irregular rectangle with large windows looking out over city and lake, and said, 'Here is where we are going to perform.' I could see them looking for a place to erect a stage. I marked off a central area approximately fourteen feet square. 'This is our stage.' One of them

asked, 'And where will the audience sit?' I replied, 'They will sit all around. On four sides.' They looked at me a bit skeptically, but were not opposed to the idea.

During that winter we made several productions in the penthouse, where we had room for an audience of only sixty. But the idea was a hit. The next year we moved downstairs to the ballroom of the hotel, where we were able to seat 150. We tried calling these ballroom productions, but the name penthouse had become attached to the method, and we found it impossible to get the public to drop it. To them they were penthouse plays, and, wherever we have gone since that time they have remained penthouse plays.

From 1935 to 1938 we played in our first Penthouse Theatre, a building near the campus which we rented and remodeled for our use. It seated 140. In 1940 we opened our present Penthouse Theatre on the campus, a beautiful modern building which seats 172, and which we designed exactly as we wanted it. It was the first theatre ever built for arena presentation of modern plays. In the eight and a half years of its operation it has never had a dark week, and seldom an empty seat. In it we play every night but Sunday, and each production runs for six weeks. We are usually sold out some time in advance, and we frequently turn away as many people on a week end as we put into the theatre. There is no theatre in the country, to my knowledge, which has so devoted a following. Partly because of the atmosphere of the theatre, which is friendly and intimate, partly because of the effectiveness of the style of presentation, and partly because the house is dedicated to comedy. We learned early in our period of experimentation that although tragedy can be done in this manner, comedy is safer. For most tragedies one needs greater separation of audience and play. The impact at close quarters is too strong. This policy, however, does not mean that our School of Drama neglects tragedy altogether; we have another theatre, the Showboat, which has a conventional proscenium-arch stage, and in that house we present our heavier dramas.

4

As I indicated earlier, the Penthouse Theatre idea has been adopted by a number of groups in various parts of the country. A good many of these, I am sorry to say, have been neither creditable nor successful. Exceptions include the theatre in Dallas, Texas, which Margo Jones has been operating professionally, the Circle Theatre in Los Angeles, and Albert McCleery's theatre at Fordham University. I have also heard good reports of the Drawing-Room in Bethelehem, Pennsylvania, and the arena at Miami University in Florida. By and large, however, the method has failed to win the acclaim which it deserves. And the reasons for this failure are, at least to me, quite obvious.

Shortly after we opened our present theatre, I was flooded with letters requesting information on the technique of Penthouse production. And a good many interested inquirers also solicited this information from Samuel French, the nation's largest play publisher. While I was trying to dig my way out of the correspondence which descended upon me, the editor of Samuel French wrote to me and suggested that I compose a short book explaining the Penthouse, which French would be glad to publish. I accepted the suggestion and the book appeared in 1942, under the title, *The Penthouse Theatre; Its History and Technique.*

I mention this so that those readers

who find the present discussion inadequate may know where to go for further guidance. In that book I took some pains to warn potential users of this method of production that it involved many dangers. I tried to make clear the fact that the method looks simpler than it is. And I wish now to emphasize that point.

5

When you move out of the standard theatre you are apt to lose a very valuable thing: theatrical atmosphere. And when you do away with scenery and elaborate lighting effects, you are also sacrificing elements which have value in the total scheme of theatrical effectiveness. It is necessary, therefore, that these be compensated for. You must, in some way, create an arena which is a theatre—which will give people the feeling of a theatre. Merely to take a large classroom and put a number of chairs around the walls will not make a theatre. You can do such a thing quite easily, and you can throw your actors into the center of the room and tell them to act, but the result is not apt to be sensational. The effect will be too casual, and the performance will seem more like a rehearsal than a show.

It may, of course, be fairly enjoyable. But that is not enough. In these days the theatre cannot afford to be fairly enjoyable. It must be first-rate, or it cannot compete with the diabolical and mechanical efficiency of the radio and the motion picture.

In other words, the arena itself must be dramatized. Our Penthouse Theatre is so attractive that people often pay admission to it without knowing or caring what play is being presented.

One of the principal considerations in creating an arena for plays is the size of that arena. It may be quite small, but it must not be too large, for the moment the audience gets away from the actor, you have lost the intimacy so vital to comedy. Our entire auditorium is only 42 by 48 feet. And this includes the space taken up by three rows of seats. The major portion of the area is, of course, the stage.

We limited ourselves to three rows of audience because we found by experience that beyond the third row people began to lose contact with the play. And we limited the acting area to approximately 24 by 30 feet because we wanted the stage to have no more than the dimensions of a large living-room. And although we could sell twice as many seats as we have, we are content with a capacity of 172 because we wish above everything else to keep the performances at the highest possible peak of effectiveness.

One of the major problems is the separation of audience from play. This separation must be distinct, yet it must not set up an actual barrier. There are two ways of marking this separation: the first is elevation, the other is lighting.

As for elevation, it is possible to obtain fairly good results by raising the stage above the level of the audience, as in a boxing ring. We have given many performances thus, when performing in clubs and hotels. But it is immeasurably preferable to raise the audience in tiers, as in a standard theatre, leaving the actors to perform on the floor level. This is the arrangement which we chose for our own theatre, and it has proved entirely satisfactory. It is also possible of course, but not at all desirable, to have audience and stage on the same level. I strongly advise against this.

6

Lighting an arena is not easy. It is difficult to concentrate light on the acting area without producing a glare in the eyes of a portion of the audience. We

solved this problem in our theatre by introducing light through a series of small, circular holes in the ceiling. By this means there is no spill of light. The light-holes are arranged in concentric circles around the entire ceiling. The outer circles are on a separate circuit, and illuminate the three rows of audience. All the inner circles are on one circuit, and they light the acting area. Before the act begins, only the audience lights are on. When they are taken off we have a blackout, during which the actors enter quietly and take their positions on stage. Then the stage lights come up. This, I think, is the best system of lighting for an arena, but if it cannot be used, then the best alternative is to employ some indirect units around the walls for audience illumination, and a group of overhead spotlights for the stage, each of them equipped with louvers to prevent at least most of the spilling.

It is these two things: elevation of seats and proper lighting, that, more than any other factors, create in an arena the atmosphere of a theatre. Without them you are merely playing in a room. Additional means can, of course, be used in the creation of theatrical atmosphere. The kind of seats, for instance. If they are classroom chairs they will not help create your theatre. In equipping the Penthouse Theatre we purchased the best theatre seats on the market because we felt they were vital to our purpose. When you enter an arena theatre, what is there for you to see? The walls, of course. But they must be kept bare and neutral so as not to distract attention from the play. The carpeted floor and a few pieces of furniture on stage. But these do not look necessarily like a theatre. What convinces you that you are in a theatre? The circular rows of seats. That is one reason they are so important—more important than they are in a conventional theatre. Another reason is that people are going to sit in them for two hours, and they will enjoy the play much more if they enjoy the seats.

7

By this time the reader may be saying to himself that I am more concerned with physical equipment than I am with the play. That, however, is not true. I am merely taking for granted that the high school director knows a good play when he sees one, and that we all have access to the same plays. Where we really differ is in the matter of physical equipment. And no matter how good a play you have, if you present it under unfavorable conditions, you will not achieve your purpose, which must be to give aesthetic satisfaction. The quality of the acting is, obviously, another important factor, but that is a factor in any theatre—not merely in the arena type. More emphasis falls on it in the arena because of the proximity of actor and audience, and because the actor has not the support of scenic backgrounds, but that is all the more reason why the physical arrangement of the arena should be effective—so as to present the actor as favorably as possible. You are asking a great deal of him—throwing him into the center of a ring with only a few props to support his performance. You owe it to him to provide the very best focus of attention through seating, lighting, and general atmosphere.

I can imagine my readers asking how such a theatre is to be created in a high school. I dare say some of you are at this moment visualizing that large and bleak gymnasium, or that low-ceilinged, oddly-shaped, cluttered cafeteria. It may be that in desperation you will be driven to one of these. But you would be much happier, I can assure you, in a room that

was cozier, and that you could make your own. In most schools, I know, space is at a premium. But if you can possibly get the exclusive use of an attic or a basement room for conversion into a penthouse theatre, then by all means do so. And turn your students loose on the project of giving it a really theatrical atmosphere. If you must justify your possession of the room by making it available for some class work, then let these classes be in dramatics, or oral expression, or whatever you have that comes the nearest to being courses in theatrical production. In this way it will be a classroom only to your inner circle. It will still be a theatre and place of mystery to the rest of the student body. Do not under any circumstances let it be used for mathematics or history or social science. That would utterly destroy its magic.

If your theatre seats only a hundred, or even seventy-five, so much the better. It will acquire the prestige of exclusiveness. And your actors can give matinees every day for a week or two, thereby learning to act by acting. This will be much more fun for everybody than one or two performances in the main auditorium. Try it, and you will see that I am right.

8

I have saved till the last my discussion of the play itself. I have, however, mentioned that comedy is the most likely medium for arena entertainment. And I wish now to warn you that a great many standard comedies are unsuited to this method of production because of their dependence on settings. We try as much as possible in our theatre to present plays which require a single interior setting, although now and again we change the furniture between acts and ask the audience to assume a change in locale. Sometimes we find it easier to rewrite the play a bit, and keep the action all within one setting. We never take this liberty, however, if it requires much rewriting or if it seems to weaken the play.

To give you some idea of the sort of plays we do at the Penthouse, I will enumerate by title our productions of the past season. These include: 'The Far-Off Hills,' by Lennox Robinson; 'Dear Ruth,' by Norman Krasna; 'Candida,' by George Bernard Shaw; 'The Late Christopher Bean,' by Sidney Howard; 'The Whole World Over,' by Constantine Simonov; 'Dangerous Corner,' by J. B. Priestley; 'Years Ago,' by Ruth Gordon; 'Charley's Aunt,' by Brandon Thomas; 'Laburnum Grove,' by J. B. Priestley; and 'The Young Idea,' by Noel Coward.

All these are good comedies, written by excellent playwrights. And several of them are as well adapted to high school production as they are to college. In other seasons we have had outstanding success with such pieces as 'Hay Fever,' and 'Tonight at 8:30,' by Noel Coward; 'Kiss and Tell,' by F. Hugh Herbert; 'Ladies of the Jury,' by Fred Ballard; 'Claudia,' by Rose Franken; 'Stage Door,' by Kaufman and Ferber; and many other comedies with which you are all familiar.

9

I never believe in telling a dramatic director what plays he should produce. He knows the potentialities of his actors and the taste of his audience. If he doesn't, he should not be in charge of a dramatic program. I should like to suggest, however, that when any of you choose a play for arena presentation you exercise great care in your choice, for otherwise you will be seriously jeopardizing your chances of success. You will find that an audience will meet you halfway in assuming that the center of your

arena is such and such a place in real life, but you must not ask them to strain their credulity to the breaking-point. It is relatively easy for anyone to accept your arrangement of furniture in the playing area as a drawing-room in London or New York or Grand Rapids, but it will be more difficult for them to assume that it is a spot on a desert island or the deck of a steamer.

In a few instances we have taken the liberty of suggesting that our Penthouse stage represented an outdoor scene, but on these two or three unusual occasions the plays involved have been sufficiently artificial to justify the liberty. Offhand I can think of only two plays where we have taken this risk: 'Charley's Aunt,' and 'The Importance of Being Earnest,' —both of them costume plays written in the 1890s, and both of them artificial farces. In the case of each of them we dressed the stage for a garden scene by the use of a few simple, highly conventionalized flowerbeds and garden seats, and the result was quite charming. In more realistic plays, however, such a playful device might well have seemed affected and preposterous. I consider it extremely important that arena staging does not become a stunt. It must not be 'arty,' it must not be 'cute.' If it is, it will soon lose its novelty and disappear. As a matter of fact, I have an idea that that is the reason some of our imitators have failed. They have imitated the element of novelty without understanding the fundamentals.

The Penthouse Theatre is with us far indeed from being a novelty. It is an absolutely valid method of play production, thoughtfully conceived and carefully developed. Its roots are deep in the past. Whether or not it flowers richly and gratifyingly for the present and the future depends on our integrity.

CURRENT TRENDS IN COMMUNITY THEATRE OPERATION

William Work

IN the last twenty-five years the community theatre movement has progressed in this country to a point where it must be regarded as a highly significant component of the total theatre scene. A careful examination of the existing literature in this field suggests that, while there is a considerable amount of descriptive material pertaining to individual community theatres, comparatively little work has been done in tracing general trends and patterns.

1

The data herein presented have been compiled from a questionnaire survey conducted in the spring of 1948 of over four hundred reportedly active community organizations in all parts of the country. Approximately 60 per cent of the groups polled returned the questionnaire. It is believed that this response constitutes a fair sampling and that the conclusions drawn from the data are representative of the over-all community theatre picture in America.

What is a 'community theatre'? The term has been defined and used in a variety of ways since it was first popularized over a quarter of a century ago. Too often the community theatre has been unceremoniously lumped in with the 'art theatre,' the amateur acting society, the educational theatre, and the experimental theatre—all under the virtually meaningless title 'little theatre.' In order to avoid this lack of careful definition and to delimit the community organization from other play-producing agencies, the following definition has been synthesized for the purposes of this study: *A community theatre is any organization not primarily educational in its purpose, which regularly produces drama on a non-commercial basis and in which participation is open to the community at large.*

The information which follows has been based on the replies of the 198 theatre groups which conformed to the above definition. Table 1 shows the classification method that has been used in compiling and presenting the data. Where the differences shown by the various categories did not appear to be significant, only total figures are given.

TABLE 1
SYSTEM OF CLASSIFICATION USED IN COMPILING THE COMMUNITY THEATRE DATA

Classification	Number of Productions Each Year	Total Number of Theatres in the Classification
Section A*		
Group I	1-2	14
Group II	3-4	51
Group III	5-6	64
Group IV	7-8	14
Group V	9-10	5
Group VI	11-12	1
Section B**		49
		198

*Theatres are located in cities of 25,000 population or over.

**Theatres are located in cities of 10,000 to 25,000 population.

2

The average age of the community theatres polled was found to be 15.4 years. Slightly more than one-half of the groups reporting indicated that they are now incorporated. Both of these facts

WILLIAM WORK *is Associate Director of the Purdue Playshop at Purdue University.*

are encouraging, for they indicate that the community theatre is assuming an air of permanence and stability that was not characteristic of the movement in its earlier years.

It is less encouraging, perhaps, to note that fewer than one community organization in six has a theatre of its own. While a permanent home is not essential to the continuing growth of a theatre group, the disadvantages attendant on rented quarters (especially of the public school variety) are well recognized. Of the 189 groups reporting, 142 indicated that they are not satisfied with their present facilities. Eighty-six of these 142, however, stated that they are definitely planning to build or hope to be able to do so within the next five years. There was little evidence of building operations now in progress, from which it is inferred that many of the organizations are waiting until costs can be more easily reconciled with available funds.

On the basis of this study it was found that there are approximately 30,000 persons actively engaged in community theatre work in the 198 groups represented. From this figure an annual average of approximately 150 active workers for each theatre is obtained.

There was a time when the 'little theatres' were accused of being cliquish—of using the same actors, directors, and scene-painters over and over again. It is true that many community groups have a nucleus of volunteers who carry out a major part of the season's work. The fact that this nucleus is no longer exclusive, however, allows most community theatre workers to participate as actively as their time, interest, and ability will permit.

Of the 193 theatres which reported the number of standing committees in their organization, the average was found to be 8.3. Nine, ten, and eleven were the numbers of regular committees most frequently indicated. Six groups reported that they have no such committees, and one reported the rather astounding figure of twenty-five.

One of the most important signs of growth in the community theatres in recent years has been the increasing number of paid employees which have been hired. Table 2 shows the distribution of full-time employees among the 197 theatres included in the tabulation. A total of 162 full-time positions are represented. These same theatres reported that they are employing an additional 142 part-time workers.

TABLE 2
FULL-TIME EMPLOYEES

Section	Number Reporting	POSITIONS									
		Director	Asst. Dir.	Tech. Dir.	Bus. Mgr.	Stage Mgr.	Actors	Office Secy.	Janitor	Misc.	None
A—I	14	1									5
A—II	51	10		1	1	2			1	1	19
A—III	64	36	4	10	5			7	11	2	12
A—IV	13	8		5	3			4	4	7	2
A—V	5	4	1	2	2	1	2	3	2		
A—VI	1			1	1	1		1		2	
SEC. A TOTALS	148	59	5	19	12	4	2	15	18	12	38
B	49	11	1	1				1	1	1	24
GRAND TOTALS	197	70	6	20	12	4	2	16	19	13	62

(See Table 1 for Key to Sections)

3

With the exception of one theatre group, which pays its performers $10.00 a week during rehearsals and performances, only one other organization reported any professionalization of its acting company. Of the 192 theatres which answered the question regarding future plans for hiring paid actors, only ten said that they planned to do so. This would seem to indicate that the community theatre as a whole is in little danger of losing its over-all amateur status, at least in the near future.

Of the 70 organizations which reported full-time directors, 64 answered the question which asked how many years their present director had been with them. The cumulative average for these 64 was found to be 5.5 years. While the disrupting effects of World War II may have had an influence in keeping this figure low, the fact remains that the directorship of a community theatre has long been recognized as a tenuous occupation at best.[1]

The average community theatre produced between four and five shows during the 1947-48 season and gave a similar number of performances of each. There was an increase in both the average number of productions and in the average number of performances over the previous season, another indication of growth and development in our community organizations.

A majority of the community theatres sell both season subscriptions and single admissions. Twenty-five per cent have individual admissions only, while less than ten per cent sell only season subscriptions. Single admission prices (at the season subscription rate) vary from less than $.50 to over $2.00, with the majority falling in the $.50 to $1.00 range.

In 1923 de Goveia reported that the average audience supporting the community theatres consisted of approximately 400 persons.[2] According to the findings of this study, there has been a four-fold increase over the intervening years. The total attendance of the 174 organizations reporting their 1946-47 figures was found to be approximately 1,200,000.

The budget information recorded in Table 3 applies only to the theatres located in cities of 25,000 population or over (Section A). Insufficient data for statistical validity were accumulated for the theatres in the smaller communities. Two sets of figures are given for each item under 'Expenditures' and 'Receipts.' The first represents the average percentage for the item, calculated for the groups that reported it as a part of their budget. The second figure is the average for the item calculated for *all* groups reporting budget data. For example, the figures under 'Receipts' are calculated for a total of 106 theatres. Of these 106 theatres, 20 reported that part of their income is derived from endowment and gifts. The average per cent of the total income derived from this source by the 20 groups is 10.2 per cent. The average per cent of total income for all 106 theatres from this source, however, is only 1.9 per cent.

4

The average total annual budget of the theatres considered in this study was approximately $5,000. Thus it can be seen that these organizations produce almost 900 shows each year at a total expense of approximately $1,000,000, or the

[1] c.f. Norris Houghton, *Advance from Broadway*, Harcourt Brace & Co., (1941) 80-81.

[2] C. J. de Goveia, *The Community Playhouse*, B. W. Huebsch, Inc., (1923) 23.

TABLE 3

RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES
(Section A)

	Number of Groups Reporting the Item	Average % for Those Reporting	Average-% for All Groups (106) Reporting Receipts
All Admissions	100	71.5	67.4
Dues	58	40.6	22.2
Program Advertising	56	9.9	5.2
Endowment and Gifts	20	10.2	1.9
Sponsoring Organizations	3	52.3	1.5
Miscellaneous	17	6.9	1.1
			Total 99.3%
			Average % for All Groups Reporting Expenditures (102)
Production Expenses	102	36.1	36.1
Salaries	62	29.0	17.7
Rent	76	16.7	12.4
Maintenance & New Equipment	72	11.8	8.3
Taxes	59	14.1	8.2
Advertising	77	9.0	6.8
Miscellaneous	33	14.0	4.5
Office Expenses	58	6.9	3.9
Reduction of Indebtedness	7	9.7	0.7
			Total 98.6%

cost of ten medium-priced New York productions.

Only three organizations reported that they received financial assistance from a sponsoring body such as the Board of Education or the City Recreation Department. The aid received by those three organizations, however, was substantial in each case. City governments often subsidize libraries, art museums, and other cultural institutions, and it is believed that more support for theatre groups could be forthcoming from that source. A community theatre, once established, should be able to balance its books without outside assistance. It does seem, however, that municipal agencies could do more in helping young theatre groups to attain financial security during their early years.

Lamentable though it may be, the fact remains that our community theatres are largely preoccupied with holding the mirror up—not to nature, but rather with holding it up to Broadway. Recent Broadway successes, particularly comedies, are by far the most popular fare. Original plays, musical comedies, and plays by the so-called 'standard' and 'continental' playwrights receive only occasional production. In the 1946-47 season there were 34 plays by 'popular' playwrights which received more productions by the groups reporting than any of the works of Shakespeare, Shaw, Ibsen, or O'Neill.

The following ten plays (with the number of productions indicated in parentheses) were produced most frequently by those organizations that year: 'The Late George Apley' (24), 'Laura' (23), 'You Can't Take It with You' (20), 'Angel Street' (19), 'Blithe Spirit' (17), 'Arsenic and Old Lace' (15), My Sister

Eileen' (15), 'State of the Union' (14), 'Night Must Fall' (13), 'Ten Little Indians' (13). Of the 'standard' works, 'The Taming of the Shrew' (4), 'Pygmalion' (4), and 'Macbeth' (3) headed the list. While most community theatres do not feel compelled to bring the 'better drama' to their audiences, it may be argued that more of an effort should be made by them to educate the public to the merits of plays that have stood the test of time.

The data in Table 4 have been compiled from a list of 110 plays which received more than one production during the 1946-47 season by the organizations reporting. The trends in this group of plays were found to be representative of the over-all play selection pattern of the community theatres polled.

TABLE 4

POPULARITY OF THE VARIOUS TYPES OF DRAMA PRODUCED BY THE COMMUNITY THEATRES DURING THE 1946-47 SEASON

	Number of Plays	Total Number of Productions
Comedy	75	312
Drama	23	84
Mystery-Melodrama	11	78
Musicals	1	2
Totals	110	476

5

In addition to the types of plays indicated in Table 4 seven groups reported that they had given one original production during the 1946-47 season. This would appear to be conclusive evidence that the community theatre as a whole is doing very little in the way of introducing untried drama.

There are a number of factors which influence the community theatres in their selection of plays. Availability of talent (both in acting and directing), cost, production facilities, and probable audience reaction, all must be considered. The recent Broadway hit with its single setting, modern costumes, relatively small cast, and strong audience-drawing power, appears to fulfill these requirements most satisfactorily. Houghton wrote in reference to the plays chosen by the community theatres:

> Much of the time they remind one, as somebody remarked, of the ladies who set up their easels in the Louvre and make pallid water-color copies of the masters; but with this unfortunate difference: their copies are seldom of Giotto or Renoir; most of the time they set themselves down to follow the Landseers and Parrishes.[3]

In addition to the regular production of plays, a large number of community theatres engage in closely related activities. Of these activities the radio workshop, children's theatre, and playwriting contests appear to be the most popular. The dramatic workshop, wherein untried talent in acting, directing and playwriting is given an opportunity for development is another 'extra-curricular' which seems to have found considerable favor among community groups. Hospital entertainments, special performances in support of civic enterprises, discussion groups, and classes in the various arts and crafts of the theatre, and even television drama, plus the inevitable parties and social gatherings, all lay claim to the time and energies of the various community theatre organizations.

The avowed aims of the community theatres today are no longer the same as those of the early little theatres in America. The presentation of literary and 'art' plays, the encouragement of the native playwright, and experimentation in scenic design are now seldom mentioned in connection with these groups. Furthermore, the community organization is no longer so universally regarded as a forerunner of professional theatre.

[3] Norris Houghton, *Advance from Broadway*, Harcourt Brace & Co., (1941) 337.

The early groups were often exclusive in regard to both their active workers and their audiences. Today the scope of the community theatres is broader and more democratic.

Two main objectives were cited most frequently by the organizations which responded to the question regarding their principal aims. One was to bring good theatre to the community; the other to provide a recreational outlet for both participants and audience. The following statement of purpose of the Civic Theatre of Indianapolis is representative of those received:

> The Civic Theatre of Indianapolis produces the best plays, new or old, available to us from the standpoint of entertainment, education and artistic achievement that will interest, excite and stimulate the minds and hearts of our audiences. It provides an outlet for any persons who may be interested in phases of theatre production, from the front office to the technical department. This theatre promotes good social fellowship and creates an interested and active working group of thinking people, as well as a more appreciative and discriminating audience, composed of patrons from all parts of the city.

The director of a theatre group in upstate New York wrote that their aim was 'to bring the best in social and literary drama to this community. But we have to entertain them.'

Whatever the stated purpose of a community theatre may be, it is apparent that the actual motives of the group are those of the individual participants. Thus one person may act or paint scenery as a hobby, while another sells season subscriptions in order to make business or social contacts.

6

Theatre activity is admirably suited to the avocational needs of a community. The diversity of the arts and crafts that enter into the production of a play afford opportunities for participation to persons with a wide range of interests and abilities. Where the symphony orchestra and the local baseball team require special skills of their members, the community theatre can and does make use of persons with less highly specialized talents.

In regard to the escapist function of the community theatre, Macgowan has written:

> Personally, I should not care how effective a prophylactic they were for the nerves of self-centered and unhappy women, or how successful in resting the tired business man; if they did not produce better plays than Broadway used to send the Road, I should consider them no more than an interesting and harmless phenomenon.[4]

There seems to be little doubt that the better community theatres are offering more palatable dramatic fare than that of the old touring companies. At the same time, it seems clear that these organizations are serving a very real function in providing a wholesome recreational outlet for their audiences as well as for their active workers.

An examination of the dramatic curricula of a large number of our leading colleges and universities has revealed the fact that comparatively little course work is offered in the field of community theatre. While this segment of our total theatre cannot be regarded as big business, it has become an important sociological and cultural force in cities both large and small in all parts of the country, and as such, is deserving of further recognition in our formal class work.

[4] Kenneth Macgowan, *Footlights Across America*, Harcourt Brace & Co., (1929) 193.

AUTOPSY ON 'THE GROUP'

W. David Sievers

IN this year of diminishing Broadway play production, in which not a single repertory or permanent acting company established itself in the vicinity of Times Square,[1] a group of young actors led by James Edwards of 'Home of the Brave' distinction has announced in Los Angeles the formation of a new company 'along the lines of the old Group Theatre of New York.'[2]

The original Group Theatre produced twenty-three new American plays in New York between 1931 and 1940 and clung to its vision of a permanent and vital theatre created collectively by its actors, directors, writers, and technicians. Although the Group was accounted a commercial failure, it is interesting to note the persistence of the group dream among those who feel keenly about the state of the theatre. To them and to the American theatre as a whole, the causes for the failure of what promised to be the finest theatrical organization on Broadway should contain a lesson of significance.

Founding of the Group

The Group Theatre was founded in 1931[3] from within the Theatre Guild by the triumvirate of Harold Clurman, a Guild playreader; Lee Strasberg, a stage manager; and Cheryl Crawford, the Guild casting director. Clurman was strongly influenced by the Jacques Copeau community concept of acting, and Strasberg was an equally ardent disciple of the Stanislavski method of naturalistic acting which he had learned from Boleslavsky. Before breaking away from the Guild, the triumvirate had presented a Soviet play, 'Red Rust,' in 1929, using the name Theatre Guild Studio. When the desired reform of the Guild did not follow, the young people (mainly in their early twenties) ventured forth on their own, taking with them the Guild's paternal blessings, a script entitled 'The House of Connelly,' which the Guild could not use, some accomplished actors which it could use (Franchot Tone, Morris Carnovsky, and Luther Adler), an unknown actor named Clifford Odets, and even some Guild financing to help stage 'Connelly.'

Ideals and Objectives

The aims and ideals of the Group are best understood by contrast with the hit-or-miss casting-office methods that characterize Broadway. The Group's ambition was to make of the theatre an art rather than a business. The Group articulated what seemed (and still seems) a revolutionary doctrine in a profession that has been notoriously craft-conscious and ivory-towerite: 'Theatre workers must feel deeply about the *subject mat-*

W. DAVID SIEVERS *is an Instructor in Theatre Arts at the University of California at Los Angeles. Some of the facts concerning problems and methods of the Group which he presents here were gained by study and work with Stella Adler, Mordecai Gorelik, and Sanford Meisner.*

[1] The 1948-9 *New York Theatre Critics Reviews* disclose but two attempts at a permanent company: The Actors Studio production of *Sundown Beach* and the American Theatre Group production of *Grandma's Diary*. Neither was successful.

[2] *Los Angeles Daily News*, 2 June 1949, 6B.

[3] Sources for these and subsequent facts include New York critics' reviews, reports of box office grosses in *Variety*, Burns Mantle, *Best Plays*, and the voluminous polemics to the *New York Times* by Harold Clurman, including: 13 Dec. 1931, 8.2; 29 Jan. 1933, 9.3; 17 Jan. 1937, 10.1; 7 May 1939, 10.1; 3 March 1940, 10.1; 1 Sept. 1940, 10.2; 18 May 1941, 9.1.

ter of plays they present.' Clurman confesses in his book[4] that he valued content far more than form in writing, acting, and stagecraft. This is not to say that the Group Theatre started as a left-wing organization. To the contrary, self-avowed radicals such as the Theatre Union at first criticized the Group for its 'arty' acting technique. It was not until the wave of labor strife in 1935 that the Group found itself in the radical camp—only to be accused of 'commercialism' and 'selling out to Hollywood' by 1937.

The specific objectives for which the Group consistently struggled were:

1. To present new American plays that were a timely and vital reflection of the economic, moral, and social life of the day.

2. To maintain a permanent company of actors who would be paid whether or not they were in a play. To pay salaries that were not necessarily equal but based upon the actor's personal needs and his contribution to the company. To eliminate the star system. (Until 1938 no actor received feature billing. Players accepted the roles for which they were cast. The five days' trial period permitted by Equity was eliminated as harmful to the actor's creative work.)

3. To develop a common method, style, and vocabulary of rehearsing and playing, based upon the example of the Moscow Art Theatre and the Théâtre du Vieux Colombier. To make it possible for the actor to grow artistically by the stimulus of classes and exercises comparable to the disciplines of the ballet. To Americanize and prove the practical value of the Stanislavski method.

4. To spend each summer in creative study and rehearsal away from New York.

5. To achieve a repertory company in which the actors would be kept fresh by a variety of roles.

6. To develop new playwrights who shared and could express the feelings of the Group.

7. To achieve a fuller realization of the individual actor's life and to raise the dignity of his profession.

8. To rehearse each play unhurriedly, carefully, beginning with detailed discussions of the meaning or 'spine' of the play until a common interpretation was agreed upon by author, director, executives, actors, scene designer, lighting technician, costumer, and press agent.

9. To conduct a school for new actors, writers, and directors.

10. To achieve an endowment so that plays could be financed on a seasonal basis instead of individually, thus making possible the experimentation that Broadway could not afford. To free the theatre from the pressure of making money on each venture by putting it on an institutional basis comparable to the opera or the symphony.

11. To build a subscription audience that shared the Group's convictions.

History

Starting with a summer of intensive work on 'The House of Connelly,' the Group totalled ten seasons in New York, one in London, several tours, and six summers of study in country retreats. The table on Page 472 summarizes the productions of the Group in New York.

Achievements

By a dogged tenacity the Group outlasted the Provincetown, the Civic Repertory, the Theatre Union, the Actor's Repertory Company, the Surry Players, the Mercury Theatre, the New Theatre League, Labor Stage, the Lunts' acting company—in fact all other companies in New York except the Theatre Guild.

[4] Harold Clurman, *The Fervent Years* (New York, 1945) 80.

Author	Play	Date of Opening	Number of Performances	Critical Verdict†
Paul Green	'The House of Connelly'	Sept. 1931	91	Artistic success
*Claire and Paul Sifton	'1931'	Dec. 1931	12	Justifiable failure
*Maxwell Anderson	'Night over Taos'	Mar. 1932	13	Justifiable failure
John Howard Lawson	'Success Story'	Sept. 1932	121	Success
Dawn Powell	'Big Night'	Jan. 1933	7	Unjustifiable failure
Sidney Kingsley	'Men in White'	Sept. 1933	351	Hit
John Howard Lawson	'Gentlewoman'	Mar. 1934	12	Unjustifiable failure
*Melvin Levy	'Gold Eagle Guy'	Nov. 1934	65	Artistic success
*Clifford Odets	'Awake and Sing'	Feb. 1935	209	Success
*Clifford Odets	'Waiting for Lefty'	Mar. 1935	168	Success
double bill with:	'Till The Day I Die'	Mar. 1935	136	Artistic success
Nellise Child	'Weep for the Virgins'	Nov. 1935	9	Unjustifiable failure
*Clifford Odets	'Paradise Lost'	Dec. 1935	73	Justifiable failure
Erwin Piscator and Lena Goldschmidt	'Case of Clyde Griffiths'	Mar. 1936	19	Justifiable failure
*Paul Green	'Johnny Johnson'	Nov. 1936	68	Artistic success
*Clifford Odets	'Golden Boy'	Nov. 1937	250	Hit
Robert Ardrey	'Casey Jones'	Feb. 1938	25	Justifiable failure
*Clifford Odets	'Rocket to the Moon'	Nov. 1938	131	Artistic success
Irwin Shaw	'The Gentle People'	Jan. 1939	141	Artistic success
Clifford Odets	'Awake and Sing' revived in repertory with 'Rocket to the Moon'	Mar. 1939	45	Success
William Saroyan	'My Heart's in the Highlands'	Apr. 1939	44	Artistic success
Robert Ardrey	'Thunder Rock'	Nov. 1939	23	Justifiable failure
*Clifford Odets	'Night Music'	Feb. 1940	20	Justifiable failure
Irwin Shaw	'Retreat to Pleasure'	Dec. 1940	23	Unjustifiable failure

TOTAL:		
2	Hits	
4	Successes	
7	Artistic successes	
7	Justifiable failures	
4	Unjustifiable failures	
24		

*Indicates a play written specifically for the Group.

†Critical verdicts are based on summary of New York critics' reviews; categories may be defined as follows:

HIT: a play that earns considerable profit.

SUCCESS: a play which earns more than it costs to produce.

ARTISTIC SUCCESS: a play which wins considerable critical acclaim and adds to prestige of group without earning any profit.

JUSTIFIABLE FAILURE: a play with some artistic merit warranting a try-out, but which proves a costly failure.

UNJUSTIFIABLE FAILURE: a play without redeeming features, which closes almost immediately.

Frequently turning down tempting salaries from Hollywood and Broadway, the Group actors exhibited an intense loyalty which was often ridiculed on Times Square, but which proved to be their staying power. Without ever achieving an endowment, the Group proved for all time what actors can accomplish by themselves if they want a theatre badly enough. While a subscription audience was never built, a record of $25,300 was made in advance sale to theatre parties and benefits before the opening of 'The Gentle People.'

The Group managed to sustain a company of from twenty to thirty actors for

the better part of ten years. While some critics have argued that many of the Group actors would have been equally or more successful without the Group, it is nevertheless true that a roster of the Group talent includes some of our very finest American actors: Lee Cobb, John Garfield, Franchot Tone, Morris Carnovsky, Stella Adler, Luther Adler, Art Smith, Ruth Nelson, Sanford Meisner, J. Edward Bromberg, Mary Morris, Elia Kazan, Russell Collins, Alexander Kirkland, and the late Roman Bohnen. The peculiarly intense, smouldering quality of their acting has been carried over with them from the Group to Hollywood and back to Broadway, until today it is very much a part of the American acting style—ably illustrated in 'Death of a Salesman' (directed by Kazan). Even when finding fault with its plays, the New York critics time and again called the Group 'the finest acting company in this country.'

Clifford Odets, William Saroyan, and Sidney Kingsley were introduced as Broadway playwrights by the Group. Robert Ardrey, Irwin Shaw, and John Howard Lawson received their most sympathetic hearings through the Group. Whether Odets made the Group or vice versa seems an academic question. The fact is that this was one of the fortunate partnerships in the history of the theatre. The pungent, theatrical dialogue of Odets may be partly attributed to the fact that he wrote for fellow actors with whom he had lived and studied for five years. It is equally true that his 'Golden Boy' saved the Group when its fortunes were at lowest ebb.

The Group developed Cheryl Crawford as a producer, and contributed a large share of new directing talent to the American theatre: Elia Kazan, Harold Clurman, Lee Strasberg, Robert Lewis, Michael Gordon, and Sanford Meisner. Boris Aronson and Mordecai Gorelik won their greatest distinction as creative scene designers with the Group.

The Group's effect upon the training of actors in this country as a result of its eminently successful use of the Stanislavski method, is something which is extensive and as yet unmeasured. The Actors' Laboratory in Hollywood, the Neighborhood Playhouse, the Dramatic Workshop, and the Actors' Studio in New York, as well as many university theatres and drama schools use 'the method.' Most of the credit for this must be traced back to the work of Lee Strasberg and the later contribution of Stella Adler who had spent a summer in Paris studying privately with Stanislavski.

Finally, the Group may be said to have collectively created the truly indigenous folk drama of New York City. Its unforgettable portraits of harrassed apartment dwellers with warped lives and racy speech will deservedly become a part of the history of the American theatre.

Shortcomings

Given lofty ideals, given fanatic perseverance, given undeniable talent, why did the Group fail to become a permanent institution?

In his articles and in his book, Harold Clurman places the blame squarely upon the New York theatre and its playgoers for failing to find an endowment of $100,000 for an institutional subsidy. In all its twenty-four productions, the Group had no choice but to follow the economics of Broadway show business and to grub for its finances piecemeal. This prevented the leasing of a theatre on a yearly basis—the only practice that would make possible experimental productions, a school, and a repertory. This lack of endowment prevented its commissioning new plays from promising writers. It precluded the $1.50 maximum

admission which was postulated in the conception of a theatre for the people. Worst of all, the piecemeal financing prevented a repertory plan, for each investor wanted his money back as soon as possible. (Its one brief fling at repertory was the alternation of two plays in 1939.) Moreover, when Cheryl Crawford left the Group in 1937, her particular talent for raising money was never replaced.

If all the fault lay with the commercial environment of Broadway, however, it would present a gloomy prospect for our ever achieving a truly national theatre. While it is all too tempting to be facile in hindsight, it seems clear that certain weaknesses within the Group were the cause of its failure to raise its subsidy and achieve a measure of permanence.

Throughout its published statements, the Group manifested a curiously naive misconception as to the nature of the audience-play relationship. Repeatedly Harold Clurman scolded the audience and critics alike for not supporting the plays of the Group, for not grasping its serious and important subject matter:

> In the case of Clifford Odets' *Night Music* we have a play so simple, clear and direct in its form, theme and mood that we ought to assume that everyone save perhaps the professional reviewers can easily appreciate it.[5]

Clurman's subjectivism, his disregard for form in art, his didactic concept of the theatre, his inability to restrain the undisciplined writing of Odets, as well as the blunder of provoking a running controversy with the drama critics, illustrate the Group's lack of (and scorn for) business acument and public relations. 'If you fail to appreciate our sincere plays, it is you who are wrong,' the Group seemed to say repeatedly. When 'Paradise Lost' received disappointing notices, an ad appeared in the *New York Times*:

> We believe Clifford Odets' *Paradise Lost* is a great and important play. We are proud to present it.
>
> The Group Theatre[6]

As Joseph Wood Krutch pointed out, this assumption that good intentions alone have any value in the realm of art is 'a spectacular *non sequitur*.'[7] This naiveté seems manifest also in the often reiterated plea for an endowment from some wealthy patron of the arts—on behalf of a theatre which had consistently berated the evils of capitalist wealth. Indeed, the Group seems almost analogous to the pathetic taxi drivers of Odets' play who sit around waiting for Lefty to save them. To the Group a 'Lefty' never came.

Numerous other charges were levelled at the Group. Some grossly unfair and distorted. But there must have been some basis for the accusations that the Group tended to be a clannish cult, suspicious of outsiders, intolerant of criticism however well-meaning, mystically reverent of Stanislavski, unduly introspective, taking their acting method too seriously, lacking a sense of humor, and occasionally casting parts from sympathy rather than merit.

More serious than such charges, however, is the glaring weakness of the list of twenty-three plays the Group produced in ten years. The table indicates but two hits and three other moderate successes. Eighteen failures out of twenty-three efforts is perhaps too high a price to pay even for what the Group conceived to be its integrity. Regardless of the merit of each experiment, a time must come when a group asks itself how many failures it can afford, and how it can hope to interest investors in a large subsidy until it proves its ability to

[5] Harold Clurman, The Conductor Speaks, *New York Times*, 3 March 1940, 10.1.

[6] Ibid., 11 Dec. 1935, 29.

[7] Joseph Wood Krutch, *The Nation*, 1 Jan. 1936, 27.

judge plays wisely and earn a return on smaller sums of money.

Clurman confesses that he blundered by turning down a chance to produce 'Winterset' and 'The Time of Your Life' because the plays were ideologically unsatisfying to him. He also admits to missing a proffered $50,000 because Lee Strasberg was too lethargic or skeptical to accept the check.[8]

Equally damaging was the absence of any revivals or classics in the Group list. While admitting that many scripts were hurried into production out of necessity when no other new script was available, Clurman has no defense for his passing up the wealth of dramatic literature of the past two thousand years. He does mention that an attempt was made one summer to rehearse 'The Three Sisters,' but nothing ever came of it.[9] Comedy, satire, and melodrama were generally sacrificed for intense or wistful portraits of the frustrated 'little man.'

Another reason for the failure of the Group that cannot be underestimated is the general confusion and breakdown of the liberal movement in America between 1939 and 1941. The Group was most effective during the depression when it could make bold partisan protests. With the Nazi-Soviet pact of 1939, the progressive movement began to disintegrate, and the Group members were not the only liberals left dazed and uncertain.

If one moment were to be picked out as the crisis in the history of the Group, it would be the period when the company returned from London acclaimed as the finest acting troupe of the English-speaking world. They then toured 'Golden Boy' as far as Pittsburgh with great success, only to abandon the tour and return to New York to open 'Rocket to the Moon'—without success. Meanwhile they substituted a non-Group company recruited by casting-office methods to continue the road tour of 'Golden Boy' and lost heavily on the venture.[10] Why, one is tempted to ask, did the Group not spend three or four months on the road, playing 'Golden Boy,' 'Awake and Sing,' 'Men in White,' and 'Rocket to the Moon' in the much-yearned-for repertory system? It may be said that the Group survived its failures but bungled its hits—by not pressing at those times for a step toward permanence.

It must be pointed out, however, that the subsequent success of such plays as 'Thunder Rock' and 'Johnny Johnson' in the university and community theatres tends to vindicate somewhat the judgment of the Group and raise the old question of the tyrannical power of the New York drama critics. On the other hand, it may simply point to the Group's inability to cast and interpret plays set outside the New York milieu.

All the blame cannot be laid to Clurman's leadership; for the members themselves never found a solution to the problem of self-government. After Strasberg and Crawford left in 1937, the actors freely criticized Clurman's administration. Three times, in 1933, 1936, and again in 1939, an Actors' Committee pressed for more voice in decisions affecting the Group. In 1940 the actors drew up a long critique of the Group's weaknesses, together with a proposed constitution for parliamentary government of the company. But neither the constitution nor the mandate of the actors was ever put into effect.[11] No one

[8] Clurman, 157, 251-2.
[9] Ibid., 257.
[10] Ibid., 232.
[11] This Group Committee Report and the proposed constitution compose the accumulated wisdom of the Group and are a valuable legacy to future Groups. They are both attached as appendices to this writer's Master's thesis, *The Group Theatre of New York City, 1931-1941*, Stanford University, 1944.

was ever clear as to the rights and privileges of membership. The actors protested that for nine years they had averaged $27 a week or about $1166 a year. Clurman's rebuttal was that the actors kept demanding an institutional plan of operation as if it were in his power to grant or deny it.[12]

In 1940 when Clurman finally offered to turn the reins of leadership over to anyone who could create the kind of Group its members wanted, there were no volunteers. It is known, however, that Mordecai Gorelick, the Group's designer, whose book *New Theatres for Old* reveals a much wider vision of dramatic art than Clurman's, clamored for a voice in the decisions of the Group but without avail.

Even if Clurman occasionally ruled impulsively or arbitrarily, much credit must be given him for supplying the almost evangelical fervor and eloquence which created the Group and which held together its zealots even during temporary hegiras to Hollywood and in spite of his tempestuous romance with Stella Adler. Clurman's book, aptly named *The Fervent Years,* is a monument of candor, freely admitting many of the accusations levelled at him and his associates and revealing some more that had previously escaped publicity. As such, it is a significant critical contribution to theatre history and merits study by anyone contemplating a cooperative theatrical organization.

The businessmen who control our theatre are accused of many things under the opprobrium of commercialism. But it seems apparent after a study of the Group's hectic career that idealists and 'intellectuals' without business judgment are as depressing a spectacle as are business men without ideals.

The Group Theatre represents a clear example of art dedicated to an ideology rather than to the search for human truths wherever they are to be found. The very qualities which were most admired in the Group—its tenacity, its uncorruptibility, its loyalty, its integrity—become when viewed in reverse its greatest faults: its stubbornness, its violent prejudices, its short-sightedness, its self-righteousness, its lack of practical leadership, its hopelessly bungled public relations, its hostility for the business interests to whom it had to appeal for funds, and finally, its almost neurotic desire to inflict martyrdom on itself.

In the face of such a list of shortcomings, one can only marvel at the very real achievements of the Group. Broadway needs a Group Theatre in 1949 just as urgently as it did in 1929—but a Group that will seek astute and realistic leadership—a Group that will look with less scorn upon the theatre's ancient and honorable task of attracting audiences. If the American theatre can learn from its mistakes, these fervent years will not have been in vain.

[12] Clurman, 272.

LET'S TAKE ANOTHER LOOK AT INTERPRETATION

Earl E. Fleischman

A NATIONAL convention, among other things, enables the thoughtful teacher of speech to get a fresh look at the field as a whole. It is an exhibit of current practice. It is also an exhibit of the imprint that contemporary personalities are making on our profession with their emphasis and notions of our destiny.

Such an observer must be led to wonder a little about the present status of Interpretation. True, it is given its place on the program. The Reading Hour draws an impressive number of devotees. But among those who do not actually teach in this field—and most of the influential leaders may be counted in this number—Interpretation seems to hold no central educational importance. One cannot escape the impression that in their minds it occupies the somewhat anomalous position of a tolerated stepchild admitted to the family circle but expected to remain decorously in the background listening to the counsel of its elders. Somehow, it has failed to achieve prestige in their eyes and is not accorded a place coordinate, let's say, with Public Address.

This is more than vague surmise. In one section of the last SAA convention devoted to exploring the salients of graduate study, for example, the field of Interpretation became conspicuous by its absence from the list of subjects deemed fruitful for advanced study at the Ph.D. level as submitted by one of our largest and most influential departments. This proved not to be an accidental omission but a considered judgment.

Furthermore, a survey of the types of subjects highlighted by the last convention seems to confirm the existence of this blind spot in the interests and evaluations current among the leaders of our profession. Again, let us be specific. From the serious attention given to Public Address no one can have the slightest doubt that this field has come to occupy a place of scholarly dignity in our deliberations. I have no quarrel with that. Public Address is a vital speech activity and an important concern in our democratic free society.

1

But let us compare the art of Public Address with the art of Oral Interpretation of Literature. Both are arts of the employment of words and of the understanding of words. Both seek to transmit that understanding vocally. Both require a grasp of human situations involving inter-personal relations, the play of action and reaction in producing consequences of common weal or woe. Both require imaginative insight—insight into motives, impulses pressing to action, inner evaluations, inner conflicts. Both reflect the ideals and faiths by which men live, which give purpose, meaning, and the essential quality of grandeur to human striving. Both are concerned with the problems of semantics—problems of the kinds of meaning, the levels of meaning, the resources latent in the word sym-

EARL E. FLEISCHMAN *is Assistant Professor of Speech at the College of the City of New York. Under the professional name of* Eugene Earl *he is known as a Reader of a long list of Talking Books for the Blind including* The Autobiography of Lincoln Steffens, Yankee from Olympus, *and others. He has also played on Broadway in* 'The Searching Wind,' 'Plumes in the Dust' *and in radio supporting roles with Norman Corwin and the NBC Radio Guild and in the series* Arthur Hopkins Presents.

bol to express that which the mind perceives, and vice versa, to serve as a vehicle by which the mind itself is able to perceive more refined, complex, and inclusive meanings. As a study of significant speech experience it is clear that one is just as much a study of mankind as the other.

We claim a high place of importance for Public Address, no doubt, because it is dedicated to the objective ends of society in the interest of a smoothly functioning social order. It deals with concerns and purposes that are political. It leads to decisions as to what to do in situations which call for practical solutions to practical problems and attain goals that can be definitely apprehended because they are objective. It affords us a way of determining, each for himself, what adjustments are required of the individual in view of the 'hard conditions' the 'time' lays upon us. It is useful because it enlightens us as to our opportunities and obligations with respect to our fellowmen.

But what of the deep springs of understanding and belief from which all worthy human action flows? There is an aroused concern throughout our country today over the lack of understanding of American history, of a full and deep appreciation of the bases of the American way of life, of the weakening hold of the beliefs our forebears wrought into that way of life upon our citizens, and particularly upon our youth. The lament is heard on every side that such beliefs no longer have much reality in the average individual's experience. They are becoming, we fear, increasingly alien to his habitual ways of thinking and feeling.

It is not my purpose here to go into all the reasons for this. But we as educators and objective observers cannot ignore the educational problem posed for us by the alarming trends of our time.

Believe it or not, this aspect of educative experience falls within the area of Oral Interpretation. The problem of the individual today is not merely that of meeting successfully the conditions that the world of men and affairs lays upon him. It is also the problem of inner choice of what to hang onto to 'save his own soul,' and in the aggregate to save the world from hopeless confusion and eventual self-destruction as well. It is basically man's struggle within himself for belief, a belief in something that seems important enough to command his complete allegiance, compelling enough to challenge his best energies, to give direction to his purposes, and to produce the kind of life that we loosely describe as constructive.

The knowledge called for is obviously more than one of mere facts. It is more than one even of ideas, or concepts, mere ideology. It is a knowledge that must be born of inner experience, vivid with imagination, and reinforced with feeling, yet feeling that is freed from sentimentality and is linked to clearly perceived objectives under the discipline of reflection.

This is the kind of knowledge that is so tragically lacking. This is the kind of knowledge that current methods and programs of education with their objective emphases and utilitarian goals have for the most part failed to supply. Indeed, for us of this generation of teachers it is a knowledge but imperfectly understood. Teachers themselves of a former day, nurtured in a less esoteric and simpler humanistic tradition, supplied this element of deep and earnest conviction, and imparted it to their students. Teachers today, one suspects, do not feel the same compulsion, nor are we urged to this task by the mores of our times.

On the contrary, we characteristically shy away from the problem, either 'pooh-poohing' it, or disclaiming all responsibility in the matter. It is possible that these attitudes throw some light on the failure of our profession to accord central importance to the type of speech education implicit in Interpretation. Certain it is that it is high time we looked this problem squarely in the face and asked: 'Just what is *useful knowledge?*'

Some educators who are now coming to grips with this problem are suggesting courses in Great Books representing the best thought of the best minds of this and previous generations. Is not this significant?

It is clear that the kind of education that we are here contemplating is not that which is primarily 'talked about,' as in a course in philosophy. Ideas, and the understanding of ideas, are important. But *comment* is incidental to the *experience*. The ideas must be illumined with feeling — individual warmth, enthusiasm, allegiance. The analysis of the experience and a reasoned-out reflection on its relative values is, of course, a vital part of the process. But the experience itself must have an arresting impact to give momentum to the ideas and leave a lasting impression as a conditioning factor for future action and reaction. Such dynamic presentation is the business of competent oral interpretation.

2

What we are concerned with here may be described as indirect learning. That is not to say that the student does not consciously search for and note specific details. These are indispensable if the experience as a whole is to impart its full freight of meaning. But he is making no effort to remember them as such but only to appreciate the way in which they shape the context of the unfolding experience. From this kind of indirect learning it is possible for him to emerge a more sensitive, a more stalwart, a more humane, a more refined and discerning individual. He is likely also to be a better balanced individual with clearer perspectives, better judgment, less 'sappy' sentimentality, a better all round person, with enlarged capacity for grappling with his own and the world's problems.

In this process *listening* is as valuable as performance, and the one becomes the complement of the other. The kind of listening called for is not ordinary relaxed drifting in response to chance suggestions thrown out by the reader. It is purposeful, concentrated, informed, intelligent. It is creative. It has a dynamic drive behind it to construct a meaningful experience. Impelled by curiosity and eagerness to know 'what it is all about' there is a challenge to put the mind to work with all its acquired information, sense experience, and deeper insights to seek out the significant clues, relate all the various impressions offered, and so encompass as large and as significant an experience as possible. Armed with the knowledge that all really worthy literature 'has something'—is born of order and design—the listener has only to draw upon the materials of his own mental life to create that order and design for himself. To work out such syntheses, patterns of related impressions yielding meaning, calls for concentration and imagination of a high order. It may appear to be play, but its resemblance to child's play is superficial.

Many elements of exact and precise knowledge are required. What's more, these must not only be acquired as separate facts, but they must be assimilated and integrated, seen in essential relationship, really grasped, before the listener can weave them correctly into

the unfolding pattern of meaning. The meaning that great literature deals with pertains not only to the objective data of the physical and social world but quite as much with those higher perceptions of mind and spirit where the elements of choice, volition, and resolve are forged into momentous consequences in human destiny.

How to listen becomes at once the major problem in the classroom that is devoted to this kind of speech experience. Needless to say, today's student has precious few opportunities to develop the skill required. What he hears on the radio is *hoked,* either by a false theatrical style, or the soporific of seductive musical backgrounds. What he hears from speech teachers themselves suffers from a variety of dilutions and distortions among which may be noted the overearnestness of the sychophant, the didactic habits of the academic approach, the inept imitation of the worst tradition of the professional 'artist,' and the undignified breeziness of the one who means at all costs to captivate the audience through sheer charm.

Equally as discouraging to the listener as these idiotic barriers interposed between him and the plain message of the original is the more positive, if more excusable, inability of the reader to grip and direct his attention to the revealing clues and essential details out of which an integrated meaning structure can only be built. The teacher-reader, like many another amateur, and far too many professionals, is a poor performer. He is unable to confront his listener squarely with the meaning latent in the words. In the presence of the audience, he 'goes dead.' Or perhaps he never comes to life. Anyway, there is lacking that clarity and force, that energizing of words, that sharpened edge of sensibility, that sudden focus on converging ideas, that unostentatious intensity of true feeling, that outward flowing of dynamic vitality and vocal release required to catch and hold. Let us ask ourselves frankly why we fail to engage fully the listening and experiencing resources of those we are trying to reach. There is no lack of desire and effort; of that we may be sure. But too frequently, it just doesn't 'come off.' Let us try to understand the difficulty.

First, the trouble may have its origin in the reader's lack of insight, his inability to grasp in its entirety the subtle interplay and cumulative reinforcement which comprises the experience to be communicated. His knowledge may be deficient, inaccurate, or inexact. He just doesn't *know* what he is talking about. His personal experience of knowing through feeling may be inadequate, with elements of falsity and distortion to cloud his perception of the meaning intended by the writer, the original creator. He may lack acquaintance with the essence of great literature, never having had a chance through his own education to develop the insights implicit there. Perhaps he can neither go deep, nor discriminate. Perhaps his perceptions are dull, or dulled from habits of careless observation, or, what is more serious, atrophied by insincere beliefs, petty goals, and superficial emotions. At any rate, the nuances of an unfolding experience are lost to him. That may be the root of the trouble.

Second, he encounters the barrier of language and is baffled, confused, misled. His interpretation lacks clarity because his knowledge of the latent powers in language symbols is muddy; his grasp of the functioning of grammar and syntax is only partial. And when it comes to the further refinements of expressiveness that words may be made to convey in their purely imaginative and poetic uses, his ideas become increasingly nebulous.

'*What does it mean?*' appears, from his reading, to be a vast bewildering, unexplored territory.

Third, he may lack the power, or at least the habit, of vital concentration upon the imagined experience at the moment of communication. The audience distracts him from the artistic purpose and sends him off on fruitless tangents of self-conscious exhibitionism. The lamentable result is that he loses his grip on his material at the moment he needs it most. The self will not down. He cannot submerge himself in subconscious creation yet maintain that communicative contact with the listener by the sureness with which he follows the elements of purpose, will, and technique. He can not release himself from inhibitions, old habits of reticence and repression, and let the audience look into his soul to see what may be revealed there. He cannot entirely make himself a vessel for a meaning more important than he is, that is more important at the moment than any scheming designs of his ego, that is more important than what the audience thinks of him as a person, or an artist.

Finally, and usually most conspicuous, is the tameness of performance. Great experience is carried white hot direct to the heart 'through passion.' To glow with the communicative thrust, the urgency, the concentration of energy of peak performance implies also the communicative projection, the command of vocal range and resourcefulness, the emanation of personal power, physical, imaginative, emotional, intellectual, to reach the ears and take hold on the sensibilities of the audience, and so to put their minds to work on the experience in hand.

Here the problem of acoustics is a part of the difficulty in achieving vocal clarity and penetration. In the theatre we recognize the importance as well as the nature of the problem. The actor must 'project.' The larger the room, the greater the distance to be spanned, the more rudely exposed is the oral reader whose voice 'falls dead a foot from his own lips.' No one who has attended the Reading Hours at our conventions has not been made painfully aware of this hard fact. Poor acoustics and noisy confusion from extraneous sources are, of course, partly responsible. Favorable physical conditions must be obtained and maintained. But let us be honest. Inadequate voice and poor vocal range and control are usually also present.

Even more than these, indispensable though they are, is what we must refer to, for want of a better word, as the personality of the reader, a composite of what he is inside himself and what vocal qualities and speech skills he may possess. The habitual tonus of his muscles in the rhythm of attack and release on the vocal elements, the characteristic looseness or firmness of grip on his inner energies of concentration, conviction, and emotion, his readiness and capacity to grasp the meaning, to join perception with the enlarging context of understanding, the stalwart nature of his will, his purposes, his moral resolves, the hold that belief takes on him and the urgency he feels to translate belief into action, the flexibility of his responses in terms of tolerance, humor, and pity, the steadiness of his gaze in his effort to see life clearly and to see it whole, the degree of pleasure he gets out of *feeling*, the degree of reticence and restraint he imposes on his feelings to bring them into the balance of a total perspective of values—all these are personal ways of thinking, feeling, acting, and reacting that impinge on the reader's performance.

This complex of perceptions, feelings, attitudes, and habits which constitute the

'spiritual' side of personality is significantly related to the deep mystery of understanding, what things means to the one who is confronted with human experience caught in the web of language, either on the printed page, or through the intervention of the spoken word. And at the moment of performance, the degree to which that meaning takes possession of his whole inner being will determine what we are accustomed to call the authenticity of the artistic presentation.

Here again is a highly complex and challenging field in *interpretation* which has not as yet been adequately explored and stands as a stern rebuke to those who so glibly generalize that there is nothing in the field of Oral Reading worthy of the best efforts of the scholar.

What, let me ask, has the field of Public Address, that is more basic in the process of individual understanding and effective communication? What in the last analysis is more crucial in the civilizing process of our culture?

3

Aside from these more vital aspects of Oral Reading there remains to be considered the technical proficiency in speech, the objective part of the communication. Here the problem is like that in any other speech activity. It consists of the uttering and combining of the sounds of our language into meaningful patterns with such precise control and resultant clarity that words creatively employed by the poet (or others seeking to present a synthesis of experience), have a chance to reach the listener and so carry out their intended function. This not only involves the enlarging of the scope of the basic physical abilities but developing in the individual the creative resourcefulness to select skillfully and almost spontaneously the vocal means to be employed.

Assuming the presence of these foundation skills, and, underlying his management and control of the oral language, the requisite vocal power for the acoustical span, what distinguishes superior performance is still the core of organized inner vitality which comes through as intensity, penetration, communicative thrust. It is here that we come to the more baffling educational problem. *If the teacher-reader has not been able to make the grade and surmount these barriers to effective oral reading obviously the factors involved are worthy of much more serious study than has yet been given them.* If from the listener's point of view the effect is one of confusion, groping, bafflement, outright 'irritation,' to say nothing of the more common reaction that the whole thing is 'insipid, dull, artificial, silly, meaningless,' then Interpretation will continue to offer something for sale but with few takers.

At this point, however, another basic problem becomes apparent. How about the listener himself? The best and most effective oral reader in the world will fail with the stupid audience made up of listeners with no adequate experience with language, literature, or oral reading and therefore incapable of recognizing and referring correctly for the kind, or kinds, of meaning the communication is designed to produce and is intended to convey. No one would hesitate for a moment to suggest that some *special* preparation is necessary for the full appreciation of music. Every effort is being made to furnish adequate opportunities for listening to the performance of music so that the best in good music may not be lost to the individual for lack of experience of the kind necessary. Yet in the field of oral reading what is being

done to provide comparable opportunities for frequent repetitions of notable experience with literature? Is it to be assumed from our negligence in this regard that the individual needs no such familiarity, no such conditioning of experience? Because the words are ostensibly those with which we are familiar in our everyday speech are we in the speech field, who ought to know better, assuming a ready-made competence to understand and appreciate the special kinds of meanings that give literature its cultural value and social importance?

Here we come face to face with what is central in Interpretation as speech education. Few of our students will ever become artistic performers with the power and pervasive insight to interest and electrify audiences any more than students of Public Address will reach the heights of public eloquence. Those few who may in time fulfill the taxing requisites must first become good listeners and appreciators before they can even aspire to the greater challenge on their abilities which effective performance entails. Performance before the classroom audience will be as far as the average student will go. And his performance there will be chiefly as a means to better appreciation and cultural enrichment when he again assumes the more humble and less ostentatious role of listener. To enable him to participate more effectively as a listener, therefore, is the chief educational task, and, when properly understood, the most pressing educational task before us today.

Such a study of the oral interpretation of literature as a listening experience rather than solely as an art of performance, I suppose, falls within the general field of semantics, but it is a study of the creative purposes of a living literature and the particular functions of meaning involved, as contrasted with the social and political aspects of language communication. But it does have a larger social significance that must not be lost sight of.

Have we ever faced the question honestly why there is such flabbiness of cultural and moral belief, on the one hand, and such intense passion of partisanship on political issues, on the other? It is the sixty-four dollar question of our time. The answer?—well, it suggests another area for research pertinent to speech education in general and the interpretation of the values and aspirations of human beings as expressed in literature, in particular.

How many speech scholars who pride themselves on an easy familiarity with the basic concepts and academic jargon of present-day semantics know anything really about these 'algebraic powers' of words to influence the individual? Who among speech scholars can say that he has discovered the 'last word' about the subtle relation between emotion and concept, between sense experience and theme, between conflicts of belief and the value judgments that are the stabilizing core of a continuing culture?

I

Today it is not an uncharacteristic reaction to be surprised, even to feel a little restive, when we encounter someone who believes passionately with his whole soul in something of underlying value and is fearless in his espousal of it, whose all-out conviction compels complete allegiance, no half way, 'if or and' conditions about it. I am not thinking of the crackpot, or narrow fanatic, but of the individual we welcome as a constructive influence in our midst. From what deep wells of human reflection and impressive experience do such convictions emerge? Where, if not from dy-

namic contact with the best thought of the best minds of this and other times?

You and I know people to whom a Beethoven symphony is an enthralling and completely uplifting experience. Theirs is a passionate love of this music that springs from a deep personal experience and appreciation over the years and an abiding conviction of its value. But where are those of this generation for whom some great passage of literature in prose or poetry produces a similar devotion and allegiance? We must admit that they are the exception rather than the rule. No more revealing commentary on the change that has taken place in our culture can be made than is to be noted in this falling off of a passionate love for great literature in the experience of our people.

Do such lines as the following taken from their context mean anything at all to the average college graduate in the way of a clearly remembered, vitally compelling, and altogether warmly impressive experience?

As when a lordly cedar, green with boughs,
Goes down with a great shout upon the hills,
And leaves a lonesome place against the sky.

We are confronted here with no imponderable. Here is a vital problem to challenge the best in speech scholarship. What is the process of creating in the individual a reservoir of human perception, 'spiritual' knowledge, and capacity for discrimination, choice, and volition through which he may achieve an allegiance to belief and come by the means of moral growth in a world of material emphases and straining emotional tensions? Teachers of Oral Interpretation, it is a challenge to scholarship that lies right on your doorstep. We who see, however dimly, these fundamental aspects of that problem should shout them from the housetops.

THE QUESTION METHOD FOR TEACHING EMPHASIS IN ORAL READING

L. H. Mouat

TEXTBOOKS in the field of oral reading abound with suggestions for effective reading aloud. These suggestions, however, are directed, for the most part, to the student: they are learning rather than teaching devices. This article is concerned with a teaching device—the question method. The author first became acquainted with the method as a student of Lee Emerson Bassett, now professor emeritus of Stanford University, who used it most effectively with his classes in oral interpretation of literature.

I

The question method deals primarily with the problem of emphasis, usually defined as the prominence given to one or more words of a thought group so that the thought can be easily grasped by the listener. It is not concerned with mood or feeling nor wth any of the subtle nuances involved in revealing the artistic or imaginative elements of a literary selection through oral interpretation. It is merely concerned with the basic and necessary job of bringing out the meaning of what is read, a prerequisite to any attempt at finer interpretation.

Stress, pitch change, and pause (an aspect of phrasing) are customarily regarded as the principal factors in emphasis. Emphasis by stress is the added force or energy given to one word to make it stand out from others. Emphasis by pitch change consists of raising or lowering the voice by glide or 'step' from its normal level (key). Emphasis by pause consists of bringing out a word or a phrase by pausing before it.

Proper employment of these forms of emphasis will result in natural meaningful oral reading. The student must use them well to read well. But how are they to be *taught?*

Here are the usual methods:

1. The instructor, as a model, will read the selection, or a similar one, to the student who then will either attempt to imitate the emphasis patterns of the instructor, or will, properly inspired and motivated, proceed on his own to offer an equally acceptable rendition. The weakness of imitation is quite apparent. At best individuality is curbed. When the instructor does not do an adequate job himself, imitation is disastrous. It is only the exceptional student who will be able to resist the tendency to imitate and proceed to develop his own interpretation adequately.

2. The instructor will correct faulty emphasis by pointing out the error and suggesting that such and such a word should be stressed, that a rise or fall of pitch might occur here, or that it would be better to pause there. Such a method is mechanical. If the student is given no reason for the suggestion he is merely learning by rote. If he is given a reason, there is no assurance that he will read the next line correctly.

3. The instructor may merely admonish the student to make more use of stress, or pitch change, or pause. He might say that there was not enough emphasis or the wrong kind of emphasis at a certain point and that it would be

L. H. MOUAT *is Assistant Professor of Speech at San Jose State College, San Jose, California.*

well to try again, differently. But, here too, only the exceptional student can respond adequately.

Sometimes combinations of the last two methods and sometimes variations of them are tried. Too often, however, the instructor will discover that he cannot quite reach the student, that his suggestions are not fully grasped; whereupon he will resort to the imitative method and read the lines 'correctly' for the student.

The basic problem in teaching emphasis is that of developing, *within the student himself*, the ability to utilize subconsciously and automatically the proper technique in order to bring out the meaning of what is being read. (It is assumed that an adequate study of the selection has been made to grasp the meaning in the first place.) The methods just described do not usually develop this ability. They fail to reach 'inside the student.' The question method has this development-from-within as its main objective and, when employed skillfully and patiently, will get results.

2

The method is simply this: when a student either fails to emphasize when he should, or emphasizes when he shouldn't or emphasizes incorrectly the instructor formulates a question out of the material at hand in such a way that the student, in answering, automatically reads the words with the proper emphasis. For example, suppose this line from St. Paul were being read: 'When I was a child I spoke as a child' and the student stressed the second *child* instead of *spoke* which seems to be called for. The instructor merely asks, 'When you were a child, you did what as a child?' The student is forced to reply with the correct emphasis, 'I *spoke* as a child.'

Of course, mistakes are usually made where the meaning is less obvious. In this line, for instance, 'The real cause of his insubordination was a deep seated inferiority complex,' a reader might possibly stress the words *cause, insubordination,* and *complex*. If the preceding sentences in the passage had been concerned both with his insubordination and with possible causes for it, it is most likely that *real* should be stressed rather than *cause* and *insubordination*. Then, since *complex* commonly follows *inferiority* in this context, while, on the other hand, several kinds of complexes are possible, *inferiority* should be stressed rather than *complex*. Here is how the method might be applied to gain a proper reading of the complete sentence. Question: 'What sort of a cause for his insubordination?' Answer: 'The *real* cause of his insubordination.' Question: 'What kind of a complex?' Answer: 'An inferiority complex.' 'All right, then, put it all together.'

The instructor might very well explain to the student the reason for the correction after he has succeeded in eliciting the changed emphasis by questioning. But understanding alone does not guarantee performance. Emphasis patterns are subconscious factors in oral language and can be called up best by some such automatic, natural technique as the question method.

The preceding examples illustrate the use of the question method when stress is the form of emphasis to be used. The method can be applied equally well to emphasis by pitch change. It is commonly known that stress on a word is usually accompanied by a change in pitch. In such a case a proper question will result in correct stress *and* pitch emphasis. Pitch change predominates, however, as the form of emphasis to reveal meaning in questions and in parenthetical remarks.

Let us consider first the application of the method to the problem of getting the proper pitch change in questions. 'General questions,' requiring a simple 'yes' or 'no' answer, usually end with a rising inflection. Such questions as 'Are you going away?' and 'Have we gone far enough?' fall in this category. 'Special' questions, however, which are preceded by interrogative words and which require specific answers, usually end with a falling inflection. 'Where are you going?' and 'What are you going to do about it?' are examples of this type. Here is where readers have the most trouble.

Suppose, when reading the question, 'When will we be rid of this impostor?' the student raises his voice at the very end. If the word *impostor* is significant, the question 'When will we be rid of whom?' will induce the correct falling inflection on the last syllable of *impostor* when the answer is given. Or, if the word rid is the important one, the question would be 'When will we get what of this impostor?' The answer will most likely be given with both stress and a rise in pitch on the word *rid* and with a falling inflection on the rest of the sentence.

Parenthetical remarks usually are read with either a lower or a higher than average pitch; otherwise the linkage between the two broken segments is hard to trace. The question method focuses attention on this linkage. For instance, if the sentence, 'He was seeing (with sightless eyes) a vista of the years ahead' were read without a noticeable change of pitch on the parenthetical part, the question 'What was he seeing?' will help the reader link the word *seeing* with *a vista*. It might be necessary to ask the question more than once before the hurdle over the parenthesis will be made successfully.

Subordinate clauses call for similar treatment. For instance: 'The union leaders, called reds or commies in letters to the editor, were given impartial front page coverage.' Here, if a pitch level different from that of the main clause is not maintained between the commas, the impression might be given that the leaders were doing the calling. The questions 'What about the leaders?' or 'What were the leaders given?' will probably clarify the relations existing within the sentence and will provoke, automatically, a pitch distinction.

Emphasis by pausing is oftentimes distorted by a slavish attention to punctuation marks. A pause after the first comma in 'He said that, if he were given the opportunity, he would put dignity into politics and integrity into statesmanship' does not quite convey the meaning. Accordingly, the instructor might ask 'What did he say?' This will usually secure a pause before *that*, where it belongs.

Occasionally, a more complicated or indirect question must be formulated in order to stimulate the reader to bring out appropriate relations. 'The proposal is unjust, because it will work a hardship on those it purports to help; it is uneconomical, because it will destroy the incentive to save; and it is unconstitutional, because it is directly contrary to a recent decision of the Supreme Court!' is a sentence that could very well defy a meaningful interpretation. Applying the question method directly to each part of the sentence that is read incorrectly might elicit correct readings of the parts, but it is possible that when they are all put together the readings would be uneven. A question coupled with an instruction would be in order in this particular case. 'What three things are wrong with the proposal? Give them in order with the reasons for each as you go along.'

3

It is not possible to supply a sufficient variety of examples to cover the many forms of expression that might be incorrectly or insufficiently emphasized. Nor would it be practical to do so, for there is no one correct way to read a phrase. At best it can be said that such and such is *incorrect* because the meaning is lost or obscured. The examples that are given here have been offered to explain the method. Further application is left to each individual instructor. No one instructor will employ it the same way for two different students nor for two selections read by the same student.

Nor can an opinion be expressed as to how much time should be devoted to utilizing this technique in a beginning class. I have found that this varies among classes and students. Sometimes a student is checked every time he makes a mistake. Sometimes he is permitted to read his entire selection through before questioning is introduced. Sometimes it is well to devote specified days to the arduous task of improving the students' reading habits by this or any other method, allowing for other days in which readings are given for practice and enjoyment rather than for criticism.

The best evidence that I, personally, can offer for the success of the question method is the responsiveness of the other students in the class when one of their number is being questioned. If his voice keeps going up in Patrick Henry's line, 'I know not what course others may take,' when I keep asking the question 'Who may take?'; in spite of their desire to remain quiet, I can hear the other students almost screaming the correct response sotto voce. It is just such a sensitivity that produces results, that makes correct responses automatic.

Other methods might be best suited to more advanced students, other methods might be used in addition to the question method for beginning students; but there is no surer way for getting students to read naturally and meaningfully with an instinctive ability to emphasize effectively than by the judicious asking of the right question at the right time.

AN INTERPRETATION OF THE TIMES

A REPORT OF THE ORAL INTERPRETATION OF W. H. AUDEN'S *AGE OF ANXIETY*

William B. McCoard

THE analytical-historical approach to the study of literature has become an accepted method amongst those who specialize in the scholarly study of literature. Unfortunately, many teachers of literature have followed this method when attempting to develop an understanding and appreciation for literature amongst those who are not specializing in English literature. Fortunately, there is a movement to return literature to the 'ear' and to concentrate on the text itself. That this is a sound development seems obvious: the written word is but the barest skeletal symbol for the 'living' concept; though many persons have been trained to read with silent skill, it is clear that the author's words rise to their most suggestive power when they are projected and creatively modified by artistic readers. Everyone realizes that, though one may enjoy reading a *play* silently, it rises to highest artistry under the creative power of the actor guided by an imaginative director. Also, it is clear that some musicians find pleasure in reading a *musical score* silently, yet the music rises to its highest expression when creatively presented to the ear. So, does poetry reach highest communicative, artistic power when creatively interpreted by an artistic oral reader.

This realization was behind the plan that eventually led to the presentation of the 1948 Pulitzer prize-winning poem, *The Age of Anxiety*,[1] for the regular Wednesday afternoon faculty-student reading hours at the University of California; for the Western Speech Association convention in Seattle; and for the SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA convention in Washington, D. C., in December of last year.

The following materials were developed to assist the interpreters as they began their study of the poem. Part 3 was also used as 'Program Notes' to prepare the listeners for this experience with W. H. Auden's poetry. Part 4 was presented orally to introduce the reading.

1. ABOUT THE ARRANGEMENT FOR A GROUP ORAL READING PRESENTATION

When literary materials are to be presented for the 'ears' of an audience, it is necessary to take several factors into consideration to insure successful reception of the author's ideas and purposes.

'Not over an hour' seems to be a good rule for oral reading presentations. Especially is this true for materials dealing primarily with ideas rather than action. This necessitates the adoption of one of two methods of selection. One method permits the selection of more or less disconnected or isolated portions. *The Age of Anxiety*, for example, has many excellent poems that can 'stand alone' without particular reference to the text. The other method requires that the oral interpreter present a unified arrangement giving the essential qualities of the original. At first glance it may seem

WILLIAM B. McCOARD *is Assistant Professor of Speech at the University of California at Berkeley and Editor of* Western Speech. *He is presently on leave and teaching at the University of Southern California.*

1 W. H. Auden, *The Age of Anxiety* (Random House, New York, 1947).

impossible for a person to receive in one hour of listening anything comparable to that which he would receive after hours of study through the eye. However, through the use of the subtle communicative powers of the added 'languages' of *voice* and *action*, the oral interpreter is able to suggest quickly much that could be obtained from words alone only after considerable elaboration by the author and long study by the reader. The oral interpreter, when using this method, has the responsibility of selecting that which is essential, and presenting it in such a manner that, even without the detailed development necessary for the eye, the subtleties of thought and emotion are clearly understood by the ear. In many cases the vocal and visual additions permit condensation without great loss. In many cases oral reading serves as an introduction and gives an understanding and appreciation for materials that might be neglected as 'too difficult' by all but the most serious scholars.

At the time of the Pulitzer award, *Life* mentioned *The Age of Anxiety* as a 'popular' book of poetry since it had sold 7,000 copies. From the reactions of a few of these 7,000 buyers it is possible that many of the 7,000 have not 'found the time' to read the poem in its entirety and with understanding. It is believed, however, that the essential matter and manner can be presented in an hour's oral interpretation so that many listeners will be intrigued into making a purposeful and personal study of the poem in its complete form. Also, it is believed that the oral interpretative presentation can serve an important function in its own right—that of bringing the interpretation of an important interpreter of our times (in this case, Mr. Auden) to many interested listeners.

2. INSTRUCTIONS TO THE READERS

This is a poem of ideas; to get them across we must also make it a poem of dramatic power. In order that its ideas, drama and poetry may live effectively, the characters and their ideas can be made to 'live' most easily if your familiarity with the material permits considerable freedom from the page—especially during the more significant passages.

I believe the intensity of their frustrating search can best be projected by sitting quietly erect with a minimum of movement—the only movement will be the slight leaning forward towards the audience as one speaks urgently.

Arrange the manuscript so it does not hide the face from the audience, yet in such a position that a glance at the page will require no head movement.

Since each character in the poem is actually searching for meanings, the speeches will not be projected as direct discourse with direct eye contact, especially at first. Perhaps the glance should be beyond or 'through' the audience. Emble may glance at the other speakers briefly, as the others may after their first speeches, but it will never become an 'on stage' situation. Heighten the dramatic tension whenever and however you can if it can be done subtly without calling attention to 'techniques.'

The narrator will stand at a lectern on the right throughout the reading. In contrast to the others he will talk as though speaking directly to the audience in a one-to-one relationship.

The 'radio' will rise to a lectern or may sit at a small table on the left.

The four characters will sit in a semicircle at the center, placed from right to left in the order of their speaking.

The adoption of the Anglo-Saxon four beat line with alliteration used for at least three of the accents will not cause

difficulty after acquaintance with the lines. The alliteration in most cases automatically will sink into the background as an interesting device for heightening the point of the moment.

The variations in the lines and forms are at no time difficult, but will serve as variations should—to give relief from the established rhythms and form, or to heighten a new development.

One item of special note: the lines are written in such a manner that one might overlook the basic flow of the poetry, by turning it into good prose. However, it will be noticed that the end of almost every line permits a pause. The pause never becomes monotonous for it serves a wide variety of purposes—most interesting of which is the hesitation for emphasis within a phrase.

The 'quiet desperation' with which men spend their lives and with which this poem begins makes it necessary that the reading begin at a quiet, undemonstrative yet highly charged emotional level. At the same time it is even more necessary that a general plan of rising climax be anticipated. It must rise in intensity. This is the most difficult part, for it will be easy to be tempted into premature climax followed by a monotonous plateau. The speeches of each character should be plotted so they rise and fall within an ever rising over-plan. Each character should be kept distinct; however, anything that interferes with the general flow must be avoided.

3. The Program Notes

THE AGE OF ANXIETY

A Baroque Eclogue—1948 Pulitzer Prize-Wining Poem—By W. H. Auden

Arranged for Group Reading by William B. McCoard

Pan American Room—Statler Hotel—December 28, 1948, 4 p.m.

Scene: Third Avenue Bar, New York City

Characters:

Narrator: Gerald E. Marsh, University of California
Speaks in prose.

Quant: Virgil Anderson, Stanford University
Middle-aged, sardonic, Irish shipping clerk.

Malin: William B. McCoard, University of California
Scientist in Medical Intelligence, Canadian Air Force.

Rosetta: Aurora M. Quiros, University of California
Jewish girl, department store buyer.

Emble: Armand Hunter, Temple University
American Navy Flier.

Radio: Horace Rahskopf, University of Washington
Its usual blatant self.

Time: It is the night of All Souls.

A. The Story

In a Third Avenue Bar in New York City four people sit, each alone in his own personal world. The clerk sees himself reflected in the mirror and tries to laugh at himself and be amused; the scientist studies the bubbles in his glass and impersonally thinks of man and his stupidity; the Jewish girl dreams of having a home like 'theirs'—of belonging; the flier hopes to find the answers to his insecurity in the persons around him who seem to have adjusted themselves, as far as he can see.

The radio, with its news of the war, distracts their thoughts from themselves and they become acquainted. Together they continue the search for meaning by discussing what they know or can remember of human life. This attempt to understand through intellectual investigation proves only that the seven ages of man end in senescence and death, and that nothing beyond this can be known by man. Then, in an attempt to go beyond the limits of such a factual description, they enter the realm of the imagination to see what an investigation of symbol and vision can lend to their understanding. This takes the form of a dream journey (which one could experi-

ence only in moments of unusual clarity or during certain moments of semi-intoxication), but at last they are stopped in their approach to the final stage by a desert beyond which they cannot go even in imagination. The search for the final realization must remain unanswered in this life.

Rosetta invites the three men to her apartment for sandwiches and a nightcap. In contrast to the frustration they have known, they all think they are finding something of value and significance in the attraction the flier and the girl feel for each other; but the illusion of love does not promise the answers they hoped for and the love is not consummated. The boy escapes his problems temporarily by 'passing out'; the girl rises to an understanding that permits her to abandon her illusion and accept reality—and her lost faith; the clerk continues his lonely, jeering, agnostic way; the scientist realizes that man must 'wait unawares for His World to come.' There is continuing frustration, but two have an affirming faith in ultimate mercy to help them meet the world as it is.

B. About the Form and Style

By calling it a 'baroque eclogue,' Auden suggests that he has chosen to make a fanciful discussion using some of the traditions of pastoral poetry. The setting is a far cry from the original pastoral settings for Theocritus' shepherd's discussions. With equal disregard for traditional dramatic techniques, Auden proceeds (with a prose narrator, and poetic dialogue, monologue, and song) to experiment and create a new semi-dramatic structure.

Avoiding the more threadbare English metres, he works in a closely stressed line reminiscent of Anglo-Saxon prosody. The Anglo-Saxon line consisted of two sections, each containing two strongly stressed syllables, and of these four long syllables, three were alliterated. (We find this to be the case in High and Low German, Icelandic, Anglo-Saxon, and in the revived alliterative English poetry of the fourteenth century, such as 'Piers Plowman.')

Alliteration of stressed root-syllables formed the basis, as quantity had formed the basis of Greek verse. Auden uses alliteration with unusual freedom and produces effects that range from heightened satire to ominous, ponderous power.

Experimental language, rescued from the useless doldrums into which the Surrealists have forced it, is also restored as a useful tool in the serious poet's equipment. Louise Bogan in *The New Yorker* says: 'His inventive powers, both in language and form, are . . . enormous, and it is delightful to watch him go about the task of revivifying old rules. Assonance, consonance, alliteration, an ancient, closely stressed rhythm—all these poetic procedures he frees from the books of rhetoric, so that they again function in living poetry and can be enjoyed.'[2]

C. About the Author: Wystan Hugh Auden

An editorial in the *Christian Century*[3] says Auden is as important an influence with our new post war generation as T. S. Eliot was with the survivors of the First World War. Most of the critics of his work make similar statements. Bogan says: 'Auden, it has for some time been apparent, has succeeded Eliot as the strongest influence in American and British poetry. This is because of his (1) intellectual concepts and (2) expert technical skill.'[4]

He is able to define and present a

[2] Louise Bogan, Verse, *New Yorker* 14 April 1945, 86.
[3] Charles C. Morrison, The Faith of W. H. Auden, *Christian Century*, 16 January 1946, 71-3.
[4] Louise Bogan *op. cit.* 89.

range of ideas, passions, compulsions, manias, anxieties, fears, and intuitions that at present float about, only half perceived by many people and most poets, in our emotional and intellectual climate. This is given meaning when we read Auden's statement: 'There must be two kinds of art, escape-art, for man needs escape as he needs food and deep sleep, and parable-art, that art which shall teach man to unlearn hatred and learn love. . . .'

It is clear that Auden has changed a great deal. The early cynicism has given way to mysticism; the desperate distrust of the world to a profound hope for it. Like Yeats he turned his attention from the evils of a capitalist society to a search for a spiritual belief. In his early life he knew what he didn't like, but was not sure what he could affirm. Now, like Yeats, he is governed by the desire to 'show an affirming faith.' This now concerns an individual change of heart or a regeneration from within, rather than a changed social or political order. Ruth Lechlitner in *Poetry* observes that 'Auden has not yet considered to its ultimate resolution the necessary dramatic tension between the individual's responsibility to himself and his God, and his responsibility to his fellow men, his state.'[5]

Besides the development of his concepts, he has smashed the tabu against tenderness. He is not afraid or ashamed either to laugh or weep (How gloomy everyone was after Eliot!). In addition he has an amazing variety of form and a dexterity and ease amounting to virtuosity with which he shapes and adopts traditional patterns to his own idiom.

Behind him stand many men whom he acknowledges: Among them are Rilke, Henry James, Freud, the Symbolists and post-Symbolists, and Surrealism at its most effective.

This Englishman, turned U. S. citizen (1946), is surprisingly young (born 1907) for one of his maturity. Part of the excitement of reading his works may be the realization that one is witnessing the product of a mind ready to develop even further. The future holds promise for the author and the reader.

D. About Facts: Scientific and Poetic

The poet and the scientist have certain characteristics in common: both are sensitively and accurately observant; both record facts of the world as they observe it; both may greatly influence our way of living. In certain ways they compliment each other. During our great scientific development much attention has been given to scientific facts, yet we are aware that this has not been enough, for while this is the age of science it is also the age of anxiety. As the scientist continues his search for truth, it is also important that the serious artist with his alert responsiveness to the world continue his reporting of the truths he finds, for good art gives shape, even to the trouble. The poet's revelation of existence has equal validity. The combination of science and art can help us to a more informed basis for understanding and action. No one ever thought that the listed scientific facts about the moon, as found in an astronomer's notebook were the only truths about the moon. Likewise, war is not to be understood by studying lists of dead, nor is the present age to be known by the lists of facts and figures.

After World War I, T. S. Eliot, with melancholy foreboding, most successfully sensed the general tragedy of his period when that tragedy had not yet impressed other observers. Auden, nearly twenty years Eliot's junior, stands further from

[5] Ruth Lechlitner, Odyssey of Auden, *Poetry*, July, 1945, 206.

the shadow of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries; he is more able, therefore, to deal with particulars. In *The Age of Anxiety* Auden skillfully creates an analysis of the present with its vulgarity, laughter, mockery, bitterness, flippancy, anxiety, compassion and reverence,—the incongruous ingredients of modern man.

Others have led us to disillusion before and have asked some questions very seriously. Is there any defense for the human race? Is there any solution for the problem we have created for ourselves? Is there a way out? The reactions vary: There are those who wish they could resign from the human race; others try to ignore the whole thing,—with equal indifference to a day of doom or a day of salvation. Some few have found a basis for hope. Auden, though acutely aware of complexity and confusions, belongs with the latter group. It is not, however, a position of calm, peaceful mediation. Dan S. Norton, in the *Virginia Quarterly Review*, has suggestively pictured the differences between Auden and Eliot: 'Auden is in the middle of the arena riding a wildly bucking horse, whereas Eliot, on the sidelines, has just completed the examination of his horse's broken leg and has shot the animal neatly through the head.'[6]

This is one reason why many critics agree with Louis Untermeyer when he says: 'Auden has become not only the most eloquent and influential, but the most impressive poet of his generation';[7] and William Elton who says: 'He is our most significant, because our most relevant and intelligent poet.'[8]

[6] Dan S. Norton, Auden's Poetry, *Virginia Quarterly Review* July, 1945, 435.

[7] Louis Untermeyer, The Change and Growth of W. H. Auden, *Saturday Review of Literature*, 28 April 1945, 10.

[8] William Elton, Metapoetry By a Thinking Type, *Poetry*, 4 November 1947, 90.

4. The Oral Introduction

(*It will be noted that some of the following sentences repeat materials from the preceding study. This was done purposely since the oral introduction should prepare the audience intellectually as well as emotionally.*) In every age, the writer who experiments with new techniques of communication is likely to be neglected by all but the few—even though he may most sensitively interpret and reveal the times. After World War I, T. S. Eliot, who recently received the Nobel Prize, most successfully sensed the tragedy of his period, before others were aware of it. Auden has inherited this function for World War II. Instead of finding the world a 'Wasteland' with 'Hollow Men,' Auden creates an analysis of the present with its vulgarity, mockery, bitterness, flippancy, humor, compassion and reverence—the incongruous ingredients of this, our *Age of Anxiety*.

By calling his Pulitzer prize-winning poem a baroque eclogue, Auden suggests that he has chosen to make a fanciful discussion of ideas using some of the traditions of pastoral poetry. The setting, in a Third Avenue bar in New York, is a far cry from the original pastoral setting for Theocritus' shepherds' discussions in ancient Greece.

Also, he has chosen to completely disregard the standard English meters: instead has used a closely stressed line reminiscent of Anglo-Saxon prosody, in which three of the four long syllables were alliterated. It is surprising how wide a range of emotions Auden is able to suggest with this single device.

With unusual disregard for traditional dramatic techniques he proceeds with a prose narrator, poetic dialogue, monologue and song, to create a new semi-dramatic structure for the discussion of ideas.

The *discussion of the seven ages of man* (based on Shakespeare's seven ages in 'As You Like It') is an attempt, in the first place, to *define what we know of man* as he progresses from *birth* to senescence and *death*—beyond which depressing analysis we have no factual knowledge.

Then Mr. Auden permits a more *imaginative approach*. In a surrealistic *dream journey*, the characters are permitted to gain new perspective. A *Dantean* journey through *seven stages* takes them through the steeps and gardens of the imagination. Inevitably they are stopped in their approach to the final seventh stage by a *desert*, beyond which they cannot go even in imagination, in this life.

Neither man's *knowledge* nor his *imagination* is able to give much enlightenment in our search for the final realization. This is the problem of our *Age of Anxiety*. The reactions of four persons are of interest and significance.

5. Audience Reaction

The student audience was the most readily and overtly responsive. Perhaps this was the result of their familiarity with the oral interpretation program as carried on at the University of California. The quieter interest of the teacher-audiences may be due to their dignity, maturity, and caution.

The most pleasing comment was from a poet-teacher who said: 'You have done well by Mr. Auden.'

BIBLIOGRAPHY

W. H. Auden, *The Collected Poetry of W. H. Auden* (New York, 1947).

B. G. Brooks, Poetry of Auden, *Nineteenth Century*, January, 1947, 30-40.

Howard Griffin, W. H. Auden, *Saturday Review of Literature*, 28 February 1948, 17.

Edwin Guest, *A History of English Rhythms* (London, 1882).

Donald A. Stauffer, 'Which Side Am I Supposed To Be On'? The Search for Beliefs in W. H. Auden's Poetry, *Virginia Quarterly Review*, October, 1946, 570-80.

Kathleen Sutton, The Clock and the Miracle, *Saturday Review of Literature*, 19 July 1947, 18.

DERIVATIVES OF MIDDLE ENGLISH [o:] IN THE SOUTH ATLANTIC AREA[1]

Raven I. McDavid, Jr.

IN all varieties of standard English, and in all varieties of American English we know about, whether folk or standard, a phonemic contrast exists between [u] and [ʊ], the syllabics[2] of *pool* and *pull* respectively. The discussion of the origin of this contrast is a matter for the linguistic historian. What this paper is particularly concerned with is the nature of those syllabics and the distribution between those two syllabics (and others, where the data so indicates) of the group of words with orthographic *oo*, where differences in regional distribution are known to exist,[3] as recorded in the field records of the *Linguistic Atlas of the South Atlantic States*.[4]

RAVEN I. McDAVID, Jr. *is Visiting Assistant Professor of English at the University of Illinois, where he is doing field studies during the year 1949-50 for the North Central section of the Linguistic Atlas of the United States and Canada.*

[1] Read before the Linguistic Phonetics Section, Speech Association of America, December 28, 1948. Much of the same data was presented to the General Phonetics Section, Modern Language Association of America, December 30, 1948. The data will also be incorporated in a longer treatment of the development of Middle English [o:] now being prepared by the author and Professor Albert H. Marckwardt of the University of Michigan.

The Julius Rosenwald Fund and the American Council of Learned Societies provided funds for completing the South Atlantic field work; Professor Hans Kurath permitted the use of the collections of the *Linguistic Atlas* and offered many valuable suggestions in the preparation of this paper.

[2] The term *syllabic*, that is syllable-nucleus, is deliberately used to avoid the misunderstanding which might arise from the use of either *vowel* or *phoneme*, both of the latter terms having meanings that vary according to one's type of linguistic analysis. Regardless of the analysis, the phonemic *contrast* exists.

[3] See also C. H. Grandgent, More Notes on American Pronunciation, *Modern Language Notes* 6.458-67; J. S. Kenyon, *American Pronunciation* (6th ed., Ann Arbor, 1935) 189-90; C. K. Thomas, *An Introduction to the Phonetics of American English* (New York, 1948), 94.

[4] The files of the South Atlantic Atlas, now housed at the University of Michigan, contain over six hundred records from 262 communities, including all of Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, and the Carolinas, New Jersey south of an eastward extension of the Mason-Dixon Line, the eastward-thrusting panhandle and two border mountain communities in West Virginia, Georgia from the Altamaha Valley eastward, and the northeast corner of Florida. About seventy percent of the records were made by the late Dr. Guy S. Lowman, Jr., including all records from the states north of South Carolina; about thirty percent by the author, all of them from South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida, constituting about four-fifths of the records for these states; one record from South Carolina by Professor Bernard Bloch.

No detailed analysis has been made of the differences in transcription-practices between the field-workers. Such differences do exist, and must be reckoned with in a purely phonetic interpretation though not necessarily in a phonemic one. However, despite the many differences in writing the impressions of various kinds of vowel sounds, the analysis of the records for this paper shows considerably less variation between the field-workers than one might have expected.

The policy of the *Atlas* is to include at least two speakers from each community (the county being generally taken as the community-unit), representing age and social groups. In this paper, statements about age and sophistication of the informants are relative. The term *cultured informant*, as in the *Atlas*, is used to designate an informant with a college education or comparable cultural attainments.

The words which were examined for this study are *afternoon* (2.4),[5] *room*—generally in such compound forms as *living room, sitting room,* or *front room*—(7.6), *foot,* in phrases of the type *seven foot high* (7.7), *soot* (8.7), *broom* (10.4), *roof* (11.5), *spoon* (17.8), *hoops* (20.3), *hoofs* (34.7), *wool* (35.2), *coop* (36.8), *food* (48.1), *goobers* (54.6), *cooter* (60.6,7), *roots* (61.4), *Cooper* (generally in such contexts as *Mrs. Cooper* or *Cooper River*) (67.5), *look here* (70.5), *tooth* (71.7), *fool* (73.4), and *spooks* (90.2). Most of these words have a stressed syllabic derived from Middle English [o:]; that in two of them, *cooter* and *goobers*[6]

[5] These numbers refer to the page and position on the page for the respective items in the work sheets for the South Atlantic Atlas.

[6] For the evidence that *goober,* 'peanut,' and *cooter,* 'turtle, terrapin,' are of African origin, see Lorenzo D. Turner, *Africanisms in the Gullah*

—words introduced into English from African languages by Negro slaves—phonemic contrasts should exist on fairly clear geographic lines, indicates that the geographical differences between the distribution of [u] and [ʊ] forms in the United States is not merely a matter of changes that took place in the British Isles.

Of the twenty words on which this study is based, six generally have the syllabic of *pool* [u] throughout the South Atlantic area—*afternoon, spoon, food, root, tooth,* and *fool;* six generally have the syllabic of *pull* [ʊ]—*foot, hoops, wool, coop, Cooper, look here;* eight have divided usage—*room, soot, broom, roof, hoofs, goobers, cooter, spooks.* The details of the geographical and social distribution among various types of syllabics for each of these words is given in the accompanying table.

Before examining the regional distribution of the syllabics in these words, it is important to recognize some general regional differences in the nature of the syllabics. The syllabic of *pull* [ʊ] is often lengthened in Eastern North Carolina, and occasionally elsewhere; such lengthening is particularly widespread in *wool,* before the final [-l], and in *coop,* for which, in the Coastal Plain south of the James River, the final consonant is generally [-b], giving a form [kʊ·b]. Furthermore, [ʊ] is very often a high-central vowel in Southwest Virginia, the Pedee Valley, and the pinelands of the South Carolina coastal plain.

For [u] a high-central vowel, or a diphthong with a high-central beginning, is usual in the Virginia Piedmont, Southwest Virginia, the Albemarle Sound area, and South Carolina and Georgia. A monophthongal [u] is usual north of the Rappahannock, in the Shenandoah Valley and West Virginia, in the Cape Fear Valley, and the coastal plain of South Carolina and Georgia; an up-gliding diphthong, prevailingly high-central, is usual in the Virginia Piedmont, the Albemarle Sound area, and the South Carolina and Georgia Piedmont. A diphthong gliding from high-central to high back [ʉu] is common in Southwest Virginia, Western North Carolina, and the northwestern corner of South Carolina; in-gliding diphthongs occur frequently in the South Carolina and Georgia coastal plain. A long high-front vowel [y·] or a diphthong with a high-front beginning [yʉ] frequently occurs after [r-] in the Beaufort area, less often in Savannah and Charleston.[7]

Dialect, (Chicago, 1949): ['guba] 'peanut,' p. 194; ['kuta] 'tortoise,' p. 197.

For a number of informants, some of the twenty words in this list may be lacking. Besides omissions due to incomplete or abbreviated records, the following facts should be noted: Many Southern informants do not use *afternoon,* but use *evening* for the period from noon till dark. *Big house* and *parlor* sometimes appear instead of *living room.* The standard form *seven feet high* was recorded even from many of the least sophisticated informants. *Smut* and *roos* were sometimes given instead of *soot.* Instead of *coop,* some informants offered only such forms as *chicken house, fowl house, henhouse.* For *food,* some informants offered only *rations* or *victuals. Goobers,* as a folk term of limited distribution, competes not only with the standard term *peanut* but with such other folk terms as *pinders, ground nuts* or *ground peas. Cooter* rarely occurs north of South Carolina. Some informants have a biblically-inspired tabu against the use of the word *fool. Spooks,* as a folk term for *ghosts,* is rare in the South Atlantic States; the more common folk term is *haunts* (generally [hæ·nts]).

[7] In a strict analysis of the phonemic structures of these dialects (according to the principles suggested by Bloomfield, Bloch, Trager, Hockett, H. L. Smith, and myself) one would represent the syllabic of *pull* as /u/, and an up-gliding diphthongal syllabic of *pool* as /uw/. An in-gliding or monophthongal syllabic in *pool* would be /uh/, and probably the phonetic types [ʉʊ] and [y·, yʉ] would best be represented as /ɨw/ and /iw/ respectively. But it must be emphasized that the analysis for any one dialect is dependent on the patterning of all the vowels and diphthongs of that dialect.

Word	Phonetic restriction	Geographic restriction	Syllabic [ʊ]	Syllabic [u]	Syllabic Others	Trend
coop	before labials [p, b, m]		prevails throughout area	prevails at S. end of Shenandoah Valley, SC-Ga coast (30), along Delaware and Potomac estuaries (8), NC (6), Upper Savannah Valley (2), Pedee Valley (1), St. Augustine (1)	[ʌ] inland Florida (1)	majority of the [u] responses comes from younger and more sophisticated informants
Cooper			normal throughout area	prevails at S. end of Shenandoah Valley and adjacent portions of W Va, NJ (2), Md (3), SC (3), Ga (1)		
hoops			normal throughout area	prevails at S. end of Shenandoah Valley, E. Shore Md (2), SC Piedmont (4), (1) each in Charlotte, Charleston, Atlanta, Augusta, Altamaha Valley	[ʌ] Pedee Valley (1)	

Word	Phonetic restriction	Geographic restriction	Syllabic [ʊ]	Syllabic [u]	Syllabic Others	Trend
goobers		1) SW from Potomac through Piedmont and mts of Va and NC, through Piedmont of SC and Ga 2) Coastal Plain from Georgetown S	common in Piedmont from Fredericksburg to Atlanta; coast from Norfolk to Savannah (5 scattered)	prevails throughout area	[ʌ] NW SC (1)	
broom			almost exclusively in Tidewater and Piedmont Md and Va, between Baltimore and Roanoke R; exclusively in Fla; prevails E. Shore Md and Va; very common E NC between Neuse and Cape Fear, Rs, SC-Ga Coast from Georgetown to St. Mary's R, Santee and Catawba Valleys to Columbia and Camden	normal NJ, Del, W Md, W Va, SW Va, SC Piedmont, Savannah Valley, inland Ga	[o] E NC (2), Lower Savannah Valley Ga (1) [ɪ] E Shore Md (1)	[ʊ] pronunciation apparently spreading. In communities of divided usage, younger and more sophisticated infs generally have [ʊ]
room			predominant Md E of Blue Ridge, almost without exception Va Piedmont, S Shenandoah Valley, Fla; common NC coast be-	predominant elsewhere	[o] E NC (1), lower Savannah Valley Ga (1)	[ʊ] pronunciation apparently spreading, occurring alongside [u] in most communities in SC and Ga. In

Word	Phonetic restriction	Geographic restriction	Syllabic [ʊ]	Syllabic [u]	Syllabic Others	Trend
			tween Neuse and Cape Fear Rs, SC-Ga coast S of Georgetown, SC Coastal Plain W of Pedee R		[ɪ] E. Shore Md (1)	communities of divided usage, younger and more sophisticated infs have [ʊ], either alone or in free variation with [u],[8]
hoofs (hooves)	before labio-dentals [f, v]		predominant in NJ, Del, Md, W Va, Shenandoah Valley, Tidewater Communities gustine, Cape Fear, Santee, Savannah valleys, metropolitan centers such as Richmond, Greensboro, Atlanta, Macon; common W NC	prevails in Va Piedmont (except Richmond), NC Piedmont and mountains, NW SC, Ga Piedmont and mts; common Pedee Valley	[ʌ] common Delmarva Peninsula, all NC, SC except NW corner, Savannah R communities in Ga; sporadic Va, NJ (1), W Va (1); not found S of Altamaha R	[ʌ] chiefly in speech of old-fashioned and less literate informants; generally remembered (if at all) by younger speakers as old-fashioned or rustic [ʊ] apparently gaining in frequency; in communities with divided usage, the younger and more sophisticated informants generally have [ʊ]

[8] In particular, the Fall Line communities of Camden and Augusta, both outposts and summer resorts of the coastal plain plantation-caste, have only [ʊ].

Word	Phonetic restriction	Geographic restriction	Syllabic [ʊ]	Syllabic [u]	Syllabic Others	Trend
roof			prevails NJ, Del, E. Shore Md, W Va, Va-NC Coast Norfolk-Wilmington (NC); common Shenandoah Valley, N Neck Va (between Potomac and Rappahannock Rs), New R Valley (SW Va), Central NC, NW SC, sporadic elsewhere	prevails Baltimore and W. Shore Md, most Va and NC, all SC-Ga-Fla	[ʌ] common Delmarva Peninsula, Albemarle Sound—Neuse R area NC, Upper Neuse and Cape Fear Valleys, extreme W NC, sporadic elsewhere (1 inf Baltimore)	[ʌ] forms generally occur in older and less sophisticated speech; in speech of cultured informants generally as quoted forms indicating old-fashioned or rustic usage
tooth	before interdentals	[ɵ]		everywhere		
cooter ("turtle")	before alveolars [t, d, n]	chiefly coastal plain and lower Piedmont from Cape Fear R. south	prevails along coast from Georgetown to St Mary's R, Santee Valley to head of navigation, lower Savannah Valley	occasionally within [ʊ] area, always outside it	[ʌ] Georgetown Co, SC (1)	
foot			everywhere		[ʌ] S Ga (1)	
root			S NJ (1), central SC (1)	everywhere		

Word	Phonetic restriction	Geographic restriction	Syllabic [ʊ]	Syllabic [u]	Others	Trend
soot			prevails in Wilmington (Del), Richmond, Baltimore, Macon; occurs everywhere, but rare in Va Piedmont outside Richmond	sporadic, the number of occurrences being greatest along coastal plain between Baltimore and James R and between Georgetown and Savannah; nowhere the prevailing form	prevails everywhere except Wilmington (Del), Baltimore, Richmond, Wilmington (NC), Macon. Often occurs in free conversation of informants who offer [u] or [ʊ] forms in response to direct questioning	[ʌ] often recollected or labeled as old-fashioned or rustic [u] chiefly in speech of younger and more sophisticated infs, including several apparently making a deliberate effort to avoid the stigma of rusticity; sometimes regarded as an affectation.[9] [ʊ] apparently spreading; in communities of divided usage it is the form most frequently used by younger and more sophisticated infs. Among cultured infs [ʊ] is probably the commonest form.

[9] For some informants [sut] is certainly a spelling-pronunciation deliberately cultivated to avoid the rustic implications of [sʌt]. Often informants will use [sut] in response to a direct question, but [sʌt] in free conversation.

Word	Phonetic restriction	Geographic restriction	Syllabic [ʊ]	Syllabic [u]	Syllabic Others	Trend
food			NC Piedmont (2), (1) each NJ, Del, Md, DC, Middle Shenandoah Valley, Va coastal plain between Rappahannock and James Rs, Beaufort SC (the last a Negro)	predominant everywhere		
afternoon			normal everywhere		[o] lower Savannah valley, Ga. (1)	
spoon			(1) each DC, S Md, Central SC	normal everywhere	[o] NC coastal plain (2)	
look here	before velar [k]		everywhere			
spooks		not common, chiefly in Potomac and Shenandoah valleys, with scattering occurrences in SC and Ga	prevails in Shenandoah Valley, Md Piedmont, NW SC	prevails elsewhere	[o] Shenandoah Valley (1)	none: occurrences of the word are too few for one to be sure of a pattern
fool	before lateral [l]			everywhere		
wool			normal everywhere	SC (5), Ga (2), Fla (1)[10]	[ʌ] NW SC (1)	

[10] In all of these occurrences of *wool* with [u], the syllabic is a high-back in-gliding diphthong.

Examination of the data indicates the reliability of phonetic and phonemic evidence for determining dialect areas within a speech community. The influence of cultural foci is seen in the spread of such forms as [hʊf, brʊm, rʊm]—characteristic of the Richmond and Charleston focal areas—among the more sophisticated speakers of inland communities. The social stratification of linguistic forms is shown in the fact that such widely distributed forms as [sʌt, rʌf, hʌf] are seldom encountered in the speech of the youngest and most sophisticated informants. Relic-areas are indicated by the occurrence of [o] forms in Eastern North Carolina and Southern Georgia, and by [rɪm, brɪm] on the Eastern Shore of Maryland. Finally, if one notices the distribution of [u] in Dr. Lowman's records from Southern England[11]—especially in *room, broom, roots*—and compares it with the distribution in the South Atlantic States, the futility of trying to derive any particular American dialect from a particular British dialect becomes apparent: in England, [u] forms of all three words are found chiefly in Sussex, Suffolk, Essex, and Cambridgeshire; in the South Atlantic States, [rʊm, brʊm] are the normal forms in the Richmond area and very common in Charleston and its hinterland, but [rʊts] almost never occurs in the entire region. Before we can undertake any studies of the derivation of American dialects, we must have at least the Middle Atlantic and South Atlantic Atlases in published form, in addition to the already published Atlas of New England, and a similar study for the British Isles.

[11] In 1938 Dr. Lowman made 58 records in Southern England, which are on file with the *Atlas* collection at the University of Michigan. A study of these records is being prepared by Professor A. A. Hill, of the University of Virginia.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources: MS field records collected for the *Linguistic Atlas of the South Atlantic States;* these records are on file at the University of Michigan.

Secondary Sources: The following works, though not essential to the argument of this paper, contain useful data on the method or on particular details.

Bloch, Bernard. Postvocalic *-r* in New England Speech. *Actes du IVe congrès international de linguistes,* 195-9. Copenhagen, 1938.

Bloch, Bernard, and George L. Trager. *Outline of Linguistic Analysis.* Baltimore, 1942.

Caffee, Nathaniel. *The Speech of Charlottesville, Virginia.* Dissertation, University of Virginia (typescript), 1935.

Grandgent, C. H. More Notes on American Pronunciation. *Modern Language Notes* 6 (1891).458-67.

Harris, Rachel S. *The Speech of Rhode Island.* Dissertation, Brown University (typescript), 1937.

Jespersen, Otto. *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles.* Vol. 1, Heidelberg, 1909.

Krapp, George Philip. *The English Language in America.* Vol. 2. New York, 1925.

Kurath, Hans. *Handbook of the Linguistic Geography of New England.* Providence, 1939.

Kurath, Hans. *Linguistic Atlas of New England.* *Providence,* 1939-43.

Kenyon, J. S. *American Pronunciation.* 6th ed. Ann Arbor, 1935.

McDavid, Raven I., Jr. Postvocalic *r* in South Carolina: a Social Analysis. *American Speech* 24 (1948).194-203.

Mathews, M. M. *Some Sources of Southernisms.* University, Alabama, 1948.

Mencken, H. L. *The American Language.* 4th ed. New York, 1936.

Mencken, H. L. *The American Language*: Supplement Two. New York, 1948.

Penzl, Herbert. *The Development of Middle English* a *in New England.* Dissertation, University of Vienna (typescript), 1934.

Shewmake, Edwin F. *English Pronunciation in Virginia.* Davidson, N. C., 1927.

Thomas, C. K. *Introduction to the Phonetics of American English.* New York, 1948.

Grager, George L., and Bernard Bloch. The Syllabic Phonemes of English. *Language* 17 (1941).223-46.

Turner, Lorenzo D. *Africanisms in the Gullah Dialect.* Chicago, 1949.

Wyld, H. C. *Historical Study of the Mother Tongue: an Introduction to Philological Method.* London, 1906.

Wyld, H. C. *A History of Modern Colloquial English.* 2d Edition. London, 1921.

PHONETIC TRANSCRIPTIONS

Five Students from Abroad (continued)

Puerto Rican Spanish

The speaker is a young man from Caguas, Puerto Rico. English is taught from the early grades on in all Puerto Rican schools. He was the most fluent speaker of the five here recorded and in contrast with the others read rather rapidly and easily.

| ˈɑθʊ | ðɪ ˈjuŋ ˈræt̪ |

| ˈwɑnᵗs | e ˈloŋ ˈt̪aɪm eˈgo | ˌðɛə wɒz e ˈjuŋ ˈræt̪ ˌnem ˈɑθʊ | hu kud̪ ˈnɛvə ˈmek ˈʊp hɪs ˈflaɪt̪i ˈmaɪm || ˌhwɛnˈevə his ˈswel ˈfrɛns jus t̪u ˈask ˌhim t̪u go ˈɑʊt̪: u ˈple wɪðˑ: ˈɛm | hi wud̪ ˈonli ˈænsə ˈɛəli | aɪ ˈd̪on: ˈo || hi ˈwʊn: ˈt̪raɪ t̪u ˌse: ˈjɛs | ɔə no: ˈiðə || hi wud̪ ˈɔlwe:s ˈʃɜk frəm ˈme:kɪŋ ə spɔˈˢθɪfɪk ˈtʃɔɪs || his ˈprɑʊd̪ ˈænt̪ ˈsko:ld̪ɛd̪ him || nɑʊ ˈluk ˈhiə | ʂi ˈst̪e:t̪ɛd̪ | ˈno ˌwɑn is ˈgoɪŋ t̪u ˈe:d̪ ɔə ˈkɛə fɔə ˌju iv ju ˈkæri ˈɔn ˌlaɪg ˈd̪is || ju hæv ˈno ˌmɔə ˈmaɪnᵈ ðæn e ˈstre: ˈble:d̪ əv ˈgræs || ðæd̪ ˈvɜi ˈnaɪd̪ ðɛə wʊz e ˈbig ˈθʊnd̪əɪn ˈkræʃ | ənᵈ in d̪i ˈfɔgi ˈmɔənɪŋ | sɑm ˈzilʊs ˈmɛn | wɪθ ˈt̪wend̪i ˈbɔɪz æn ˈgɜls | ˈroḍ ˈo:p æn ˌlukᵗ ˈklosli æḍ ðɪ ˈfɔlɛn ˌbɑɜn || ˈwɑn ov ˌðɛm ˈslɪpᵈ ˈbæk t̪u ˈbrokɛn ˈbɔəd̪ æn ˌso ə ˈskwɑʃᵗ ˈjuŋ ˈrat̪ | ˈkwaɪd̪: ˈɛd̪ | ˌhav ˈin ən ˌhav ˈaʊt̪ ɑv ʰiz ˈho:l || ˈðɔs | ɪn ðɪ ˈɛnd̪ ɑv ðɪ ˈpʊə ˈʃɜkə ˌgat̪ hɪs ˈdʒʊsᵗ ˈd̪uz || ˈɔdli iˈnɒf his ˌænt̪ ˈhɛlɛn wɔz ˈglæd̪ || aɪ ˈheːt̪ ˌsɒtʃ ˈuzi | ˈɔɪli ˈsniks | ˌʂi ˈsɛḍ ||

Mexican Spanish

The speaker is a young man from Mexico City who came to the United States in September, 1948. He had studied English for two years in the National Agriculture School in Mexico, learning grammar and translating technical bulletins in agriculture. At the time this recording was made he was still very hesitant in conversing in English. His reading was more fluent than his conversation.

| ˈɑθu | ðə ˈjuŋᵍ ˈrat̪ |

| ˈwʌnᵗs | e ˈloŋ ˈt̪ain eˈgoʊ | ˌðɛr wʊz e ˈjuŋᵍ ˈrat̪ nemˈᵊd̪ ˈɑθu | hu kʊd ˈnɛvɛr ˌmek ˈʊp hɪs ˈflaɪt̪ɪ ˈmaɪnd̪ || hwɛnˈɛvɛr hɪs ˈswɛl ˈfrɛnd̪ ˈjusɛd̪ t̪u ˈask ˌhɪm t̪u go ˈɑʊt̪ t̪u ˈpleˡ wɪðˑ: ˈɛm | hi wuḍ ˈonli ˈɑnsɛr ˈɛrəli | ˌaɪ ˈd̪on: ˈo || hi ˈwuḍⁿ ˈt̪raɪ t̪u ˌse ˈjɛs | ɔr ˈno ˈiðər || hi wuḍ ˈolso ˈɔlwez ˈʃɛrk frəm ˈmekɪŋ e spɪˈsɪfɪk ˈtʃɔɪs || hɪs ˌprɑʊd ˈɑnt̪ ˈhelən ˈskolᵈəd̪ ˌhim || ˌnɑʊ ˈlʊk ʰhir | ʂi ˈst̪eˈt̪əd̪ || ˈno ˈwʌn ɪs ˈgoᵘɪŋ t̪u ˈaɪd̪ ɔr ˈkɛr fɔr ˌju ɪv ˌju ˈkæri ˈɔn ˌlaɪk ʰðis || ˌju hᵡav ˈnoᵘ ˈmɔr ˈmaɪnd ðɑt̪ eˡ ˈst̪re ˈbleḍ ɑv ˈgras || ðɑt̪ ˈverɪ ˈnaɪt̪ ðɛr ˌwɑz eˡ ˈbig ˈθʊnd̪ɛrɪŋ ˈkraʃ | ɑnḍ in ðɪ ˈfɔgi ˈmɔrnɪŋ ˌsʌm ˈzɛlus ˈmɛn | wɪð ˈt̪wɛnt̪i ˈbɔɪs ɑnᵈ ˈgɜrls | ˈroᵘd ˈoʊp ɑnᵈ ˈlukɛd̪ ˈkloᵛsli at̪ ðɪ ˈfɔlɛn ˈbɑrn || ˈwɑn ovᵊ ˈðɛm ˈslɪpɛd̪ ˈbak e ˈbrokɛn ˈbord ɑnᵈ ˌsɔ e ˈskwɑʃɛd̪ ˈjuŋᵍ ˈrat̪ | ˌkwɑɪd̪: ˈɛd | ˈhæf ɪnᵊ ən ˈhæf ˈɔt̪ ə hɪs ˈhoᵘl || ˈðoʊs | ɪn ðɪ ˈɛnd̪ | ðə ˈpur ˈʃɜrkɜr gɔt̪ hɪz ˈdʒʌst̪ ˈdjus || ˈoʊd̪lɪ ɪˈnof | hɪs ˈproḍ ˈɑnt̪ ˈɛlɛn wos ˈglad̪ || aɪ ˈhɛt̪ ˌsʌtʃ ˈusi | ˈɔɪli ˈsniks | ˌsɛḍ ˈʂi ||

ITALIAN

The speaker is a 23-year-old girl from Rome, Italy, who came to the United States in November, 1948. She had studied English for three months in Italy and had attended evening classes at high school in the United States for four months. This reading was even slower than her normal conversation, which was retarded by a limited vocabulary and uncertainty of pronunciation.

| ɑr'tur | ðɪ 'jʌŋ 'rɛt |

| 'wɑn's | eɪ 'loŋ 'taɪm e'goʊ | ðɛr ˌwɔs eɪ 'jʌŋ 'rɛt ˌneɪm ɑr'tur | hu kud 'ne'vɛr ˌme'k 'ʌp hɪs 'flaɪti 'maɪnd || hwen'e'vər his 'swɛl 'frɪ^{ə}ns ˌjusd^{ə} tu 'a^{ə}sk 'him tu ˌgo^{ʊ} 'ɑʊt tu 'ple^{ɪ} wiθ 'ðɛm | hi hwud 'oʊnli 'ansər 'eɪrɪli | aɪ 'doʊn: 'o || hi 'wu:nt: 'raɪ tu ˌse 'jɛs ɔr 'no^{ʊ} 'e'ðər || hi hwud 'olwes 'skɪp frəm 'meɪkɪŋ e spi'sifɪk 't$\int$ɔɪs || his 'prɑʊd 'ænt 'hɛlɛn 'sko^{ʊ}ldɛd ˌhim || ˌnɑʊ 'lʊk 'hɪə^{r} | $\int$i 'steɪ:tɛd || 'no^{ʊ} 'wɑn is 'go^{ʊ}ɪŋ tu 'eɪd ɔr 'ke^{r} fər 'ju ɪf ˌju 'kæri ən 'laɪk 'ðis || ju hɛv 'no 'mər 'maɪnd ðɛn e^{ɪ} 'streɪ 'bleɪd ov 'grɛs || 'ðɛt 'vɛri 'naɪ:t ðɛr wɑs e 'bɪg 'θɑndərɪŋ 'krɛ$\int$ | æn in ði 'fəgi 'mərnɪŋ sɑm 'zilus 'mɛn | wɪθ 'twɛndi 'bɔɪs æn 'gɜrls | 'ro^{ʊ}d 'ʌp æn 'lukɛd 'klo^{ʊ}zli ɛd ðə 'fʌlən 'bɑ:rn || 'wɑn ov 'ðɛm 'slipɛd 'bɛk e 'broʊkən 'bord ən^{d} ˌso e 'skwaɪ$\int$ɛd 'jʊŋ^{g} 'rɛt | 'kwaɪt 'dɛd | ˌhɑf 'in ænd 'hæf 'ɑʊt ov hiz 'hol || 'ðo^{ʊ}s | in ðɪ 'end | ði 'pur 'skɜrkər gɑt hiz 'dʒɛst 'dus || 'ɑdli i'nof | his 'hant 'elɛn woz 'glɛd || aɪ 'he't ˌsɑt$\int$ 'uzi | 'ɔɪli 'zne'ks | ˌsed '$\int$i ||

CHINESE

The speaker is a 24-year-old girl from Canton, China, who came to the United States in the fall of 1948. She had studied English for six years during high school and college and had read English textbooks in college, although Chinese was spoken in the classroom. She read at an average rate, hesitating occasionally on the pronunciation of a few words.

| 'ɔθə | di 'jʌŋ 'rɛt |

| 'wʊns | e 'loŋ 'taɪm ə'go | dɛɚ wɒz e 'jʌŋ 'rɛt ˌnem 'ɔθə | hu kʊd 'nɛvɚ 'mek 'ɒp his 'flaɪti 'maɪn^{t} || hwen'evɚ his 'swɛl 'frɛns ˌjus tu 'ɑsk ˌhim tu go 'ɑʊt: u 'pl$_{r}$e wif ˌhim | hi 'wʊnt 'onli 'ansɚ 'ɛrɪli | aɪ 'don 'do || hi 'wʊnt: 'raɪ tu ˌse: 'jes ɔɚ 'no: 'idɚ || hi ˌwʊnt 'ɔlwe:s 'sriŋk frɒm 'me:kɪŋ ɛ 'spɛsɪfɪk 't$\int$ɔɪs || hɪs 'prɑʊd 'ænt 'hɛlɛn 'skold him || nɑʊ 'lʊk 'hiɚ | $\int$i 'ste:t | 'no 'wʌ^{n} is 'goɪŋ tu 'æd ɔɚ 'keɚ fɔɚ ˌju if ju 'kɛri 'ɔn ˌlaɪk 'dis || ju hæf 'no 'mɔɚ 'maɪn^{d} dæn e 'stre 'bled ɑv 'grɑs || dæt 'wɛri 'naɪt dɛɚ wɒz e 'bɪg 'θʌndɛɚ 'kra$\int$ ænd in di 'fəgi 'mɔɚnɪŋ | sɒm 'zoələs 'mɛn | wiθ 'twɛndi 'bɔɪs æn 'gɜls | ˌrot 'ɒp æn 'lʊk^{t} 'kl$_{r}$osli æt: ə 'fʌlɪŋ 'bɑɚn || 'wɑn ov ˌdɛm 'slɪp^{t} 'bæk e 'broken 'bɔɚd ænd ˌsɔ e 'skwæ$\int$t 'jʌŋ 'rɛt | 'kwaɪt 'de^{d} | ˌhɑf 'in ən ˌhɑf 'ɑʊt ɑv his 'holt || 'dʌs | in di 'ent ɑv 'puɚ '$\int$ɜkɚ gɔt his 'dʒʌst 'djus || 'odli i'nʌf | his 'ænt 'hɛlɛn wɑs 'glæt || aɪ 'het ˌsʌt$\int$ 'uzi | 'oli 'snis | ˌse^{t} '$\int$i ||

Transcribed from disc recordings by

SHIRLEY BRIGANCE
Alabama Polytechnic Institute

THE FORUM

JOINT CONVENTION OF THE ASSOCIATIONS

December 28-29-30, 1949
Hotel Stevens, Chicago

To All Members:

SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA
American Speech and Hearing Association
American Educational Theatre Association
Committee on Debate Materials of the National University Extension Association

The Officers and Executive Councils of all the cooperating associations cordially invite you and all people interested in the various aspects of speech, speech correction, and drama, to join in the annual convention of these associations this December. This will be the 34th annual meeting of the SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, the 25th annual meeting of the American Speech and Hearing Association, and the 14th annual meeting of the American Educational Theatre Association.

The Program Committees of the various associations have prepared for the three days of the convention a program of meetings rich in professional stimulation and opportunities for friendship among your colleagues. In accord with the tradition of our joint conventions, all associations will meet together twice during the three days—once at the opening general session and again at the joint luncheon on Thursday noon, December 29. At the opening session the address of welcome will be given by the Honorable Ralph E. Church, Congressman from the Thirteenth District, Illinois. This will be followed by presidential addresses from the leaders of the three cooperating associations—James H. McBurney, Northwestern University, for the SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA; Delyte W. Morris, Southern Illinois University, for the American Speech and Hearing Association; and Hubert Heffner, Stanford University, for the American Educational Theatre Association. These addresses will touch the general theme, 'Areas in the Study of Speech—What Do They Have in Common?'

For the joint luncheon of the Associations the speaker will be T. V. Smith, Maxwell Professor of Citizenship and Philosophy, Syracuse University, whose subject is 'Eye, Ear, Nose, and Throat—The Exercise and the Education Thereof.'

In addition to these joint meetings, the SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA has scheduled three general sessions. The first of these, 'Philosophy of Speech in a Democratic Society,' is intended to keynote the entire convention. This session is to be a panel discussion between representatives of science, journalism, education, and government. Participants for science, journalism, and education are:

Dr. Harold C. Urey, Institute for Nuclear Studies, University of Chicago
Robert J. Blakely, Editor of the editorial page, *St. Louis Star-Times*
Dr. Rexford Mitchell, President, State Teachers College, La Crosse, Wisconsin

Final acceptance of the participant for government has not been received at this time of going to press. Dr. Orville Hitchcock, Executive Vice-President of the SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, will be moderator.

The next general session is on 'The

Future of Speech Education in America,' with Andrew T. Weaver, University of Wisconsin, as moderator. The speakers are:

Eldridge T. McSwain, Professor of Education and Dean of the University College, Northwestern University
James Milton O'Neill, Chairman, Department of Speech, Brooklyn College
Karl R. Wallace, Head, Department of Speech, University of Illinois

In addition to these there will be a general session presenting a debate forum on the National High School question. This will be an East-West debate between prominent members of our own Associations:

Ralph Y. McGinnis, University of Montana
Roy C. McCall, University of Oregon
Forrest L. Seal, DePauw University
David C. Ralph, University of Missouri

This session will be moderated by T. Earle Johnson, University of Alabama, and will be a joint meeting of the SAA and NUEA.

In addition to these meetings the American Educational Theatre Association is presenting two general sessions. The first is on 'New Trends in Theatre Education' with Monroe Lippman, Tulane University, as chairman, and as featured speakers:

Marjorie Dycke, New York City
F. Cowles Strickland, Stanford University
Lee Norvelle, Indiana University
Juana de Laban, University of Michigan
Shirley Dodge, University of Texas

The second general session for AETA is on 'The American Theatre Scene' with H. D. Albright, Cornell University, as chairman, and a list of seven distinguished speakers:

Rosamond Gilder, U. S. Center of International Theatre Institute
Robert Breen, American National Theatre and Academy
Maurice Gnesin, National Theatre Conference
Hubert C. Heffner, American Educational Theatre Association
Fred Eastman, Chicago Theological Seminary
F. Cowles Strickland, Stanford University
Sydney J. Harris, *Chicago Daily News*

The American Speech and Hearing Association has arranged a program of short courses, work conference meetings, and sectional meetings. These are as follows:

Hearing Disorders

Hearing Programs; Organization and Instrumentation
Clinical Procedures in Hearing Rehabilitation
Scientific Bases of Hearing
Hearing Aid Procedures

Speech Disorders

Clinical and Research Aspects
Voice and Articulation Disorders
Stuttering—Research, Diagnosis, Therapy
Etiology of Cerebral Palsy—Medical Specialist
Short Course—Dysphonia
Organic Speech Disorders
Panel Discussion—Aphasia
Instruments for Clinic and Research Programs
Psychological Techniques Used in Speech and Hearing Clinics
Educational Aspects
Speech Correction at the Elementary School Level
Speech Correction at the Intermediate and High School Level
State Requirements for Teacher License in Speech Correction

Other Sections

Experimental Phonetics, two sections (ASHA, SAA)
Visual Aids: Motion Pictures and Slides

The sectional meetings scheduled by the American Educational Theatre Association are as follows:

Acting
Technical Production
Playwriting
Directing (Advanced)
Theatre History
Dramatic Literature
Dramatic Criticism
Radio and Television
Cinema
Children's Theatre
High School Theatre

Technical Production in High School
Acting Problems in the High School
Directing Problems in the High School
College and University Theatre
Teaching Techniques in Theatre
Graduate Studies
The Theatre Student Looks Ahead

The Sectional meetings scheduled by the SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA are as follows:

Teaching of Speech
- Demonstration of Elementary School Teaching Techniques
- Speech in Elementary Schools
- Demonstration of Secondary School Teaching Techniques
- Secondary School Speech Curriculum
- Teacher Education in Speech
- History of Speech Education
- College Speech Curriculum

Oral Interpretation
- Oral Approach to Literature
- Contributions of Oral Interpretation
- Two Reading Hours

Rhetoric and Public Speaking
- Symposium on Problems of Criticism Rhetoric
- Contemporary Public Speaking
- British Public Address
- Preaching in America

Debate and Discussion
- Place of Discussion in American Life
- Discussion as a Classroom Teaching Technique
- Administration of High School Forensics (SAA, NUEA)
- College Forensic Trends and Practices
- Open Meeting of Committee on Intercollegiate Debate and Discussion

Voice and Phonetics
- Voice and Diction
- Linguistic Phonetics

Television and Radio
- College Curriculum in Television and Radio
- Television and Radio Demonstrations

Other Sections
- Speech and Human Relations
- Communication in Business
- Social Control Studies in Speech
- Semantics
- The Library and the Speech Teacher
- Listening
- Graduate Study

Note especially the sections on Demonstrations of Teaching Techniques, Communication in Business, the Library and the Speech Teacher, and Listening. In addition to all these features there are to be a special presentation of Molière's 'Tartuffe' by the Northwestern University School of Speech, and tours of radio and television studios. More than half a hundred prominent members of the cooperating Associations have participated in the planning and building of these programs.

Included in a long list of guest speakers from outside our Associations the following names should be added to those already mentioned:

Joseph L. Blau, Professor of Philosophy, Columbia University

Mrs. Marc A. Law, League of Women Voters of the United States

Leland Bradford, Director of Division of Adult Education, NEA

A. H. Marckwardt, Professor of English, University of Michigan, Director, *Linguistic Atlas for the North Central States*

S. I. Hayakawa, Illinois Institute of Technology, Editor, *Etc., A Review of General Semantics*

Harold A. Anderson, University of Chicago, Chairman of the Committee on Listening of the National Council of Teachers of English

Captain Kenneth B. Clark, Special Staff School, United States Air Force

Kenneth Wood, Assistant Vice President, American Telephone and Telegraph Company, New York City

Thomas R. Reid, Vice President in Charge of Human Relations, McCormick and Company, Baltimore, Maryland; Chairman, Committee to Coordinate Personnel, Procedure, Practice, and Policy for the Military Establishment

Robert Galvin, Vice President, Motorola Incorporated, Chicago, Illinois

H. G. Kenagy, Vice President, Public Relations, Mutual Benefit Life Insurance Company, Newark, New Jersey

H. F. North, Industrial Relations Manager, Swift and Company, Chicago, Illinois

LeRoy Lewis, Educational Director, American Institute of Banking

Francis P. Chisholm, President, International Society of General Semantics

Paul Butler, Editor and Manager 'Books-Churches-Schools,' *New York Daily Mirror*

Edgar Dewitt Jones, Minister Emeritus, Central Woodward Christian Church, Detroit
Ralph Ellsworth, Director of Libraries, State University of Iowa
H. H. Remmers, Director, Division of Educational Reference, Purdue University
A. R. Gilliland, Professor of Psychology, Northwestern University
Morse Salisbury, Director, Public Information Section, Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D. C.
Leo Shapiro, Department of Education, Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, Chicago, Illinois
Lorraine Lundberg, San Diego Junior College, California
H. H. Shelby, Elgin High School, Elgin, Illinois
Gaylord Ramsey, Oak Park High School, Oak Park, Illinois
James I. Brown, College of Education, University of Colorado
Willard R. Harwood, Director, Audio-Visual Education, Salt Lake City, Utah
Roger B. Maas, Wisconsin State Board of Health
Ignatius Smith, O.P., Catholic University, Washington, D. C.
Thomas T. Blewett, Dean of Faculty, Christian College, Columbia, Mississippi
Robert Breen, Executive Secretary, American National Theatre and Academy
Carl E. Burkland, Professor of English in the College of Engineering, University of Michigan
Rita Criste, Evanston Public Schools, Evanston, Illinois
Shirley Dodge, Dance Instructor, University of Texas
Fred Eastman, Chicago Theological Seminary
Rosamund Gilder, Secretary, U. S. Center of International Theatre Institute
Sydney J. Harris, Critic, *Chicago Daily News*
Juana de Laban, Dance Instructor, University of Michigan
William Lang, Professor of History, Iowa State Teachers College
Eldridge T. McSwain, Professor of Education and Dean of the University College, Northwestern University
Bernard Weinberg, Associate Professor of Romance Languages, Northwestern University

Space does not permit us to list all guest speakers.

The Committee on Local Arrangements, headed by Dr. Charles F. Hunter, of Northwestern University, is carrying forward arrangements for your convenience and enjoyment while you are at the convention. Many of us know from past experience that the Stevens Hotel is an especially fine place for a convention. We shall look forward to seeing you there.

HORACE G. RAHSKOPF,
University of Washington
First Vice-President
SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

A COMMENT FROM GBS ON E. J. WEST'S REVIEWS

I cannot read books about myself, and do not want other people to read them. If they are interested in the subject they can read what I have written, not what somebody else thinks I must mean, plus all the ideas he associates with his notions, of which I am entirely innocent. The Shavian Essayists are often not only good friends and faithful fans, but interesting authors on their own account. But they should be read for their own sakes, not for mine.

G. BERNARD SHAW,
Welwyn, Herts, England

ON GRADUATE STUDY IN INTERPRETATION

Professor Bacon's article in the October issue on Graduate Studies in Interpretation raises an interesting question; but most graduate schools are likely to demand clearer and more specific suggestions before approving work in this field, especially for a major. It is hardly to be expected that those schools which emphasize factual research to the point of excluding all creative and all skill-building courses will give his plea anything more than a brush-off. On the other hand there is certainly need for a highly advanced level of instruction and talent development in reading skills, and also for genuine research in the histori-

cal, literary, and aesthetic problems mentioned (and many more not mentioned), and I see no reason why those graduate schools which have already recognized creative work in drama, theatre, music, and the graphic arts should not welcome the suggestions offered.

JOHN DOLMAN, JR.,
University of Pennsylvania

GOOD CRITICAL WRITING

Several years ago, in a discerning essay on The Goon and His Style, Frederick Lewis Allen described a goon as a person with a heavy, stolid touch who 'forgets that he is addressing ordinary human beings, and writes for something strange and portentous which he thinks of as a Public.'[1] The goonish style 'suggests the sort of oatmeal served at lunch counters, lumpy and made with insufficient salt.'[2]

Rhetorical critics are subject to the charge of being mighty and insufferable goons. We have reached a stage of maturity in our research. We have integrated the best of the classical tradition with tested contemporary doctrine to the point where our methodology has become fairly well standardized and accepted. We have a sufficiently substantial body of research, both in the theory and the application of rhetorical criticism, to enable us to walk with dignity in academic groves. We are respectable, but with respectability has come stuffiness. With dignity has come dullness. There is an aura attaching to membership on the committee of graduate studies that makes us frantic if we aren't pedantic.

This criticism is germane because of the very nature of the task of the rhetorical critic. The distinctions and the relationship between rhetorical and literary criticism have been clearly set forth by Wichelns and others. The most basic of the differences between the two disciplines is that the fundamental object of the two is different. The literary critic has as his object the printed or the written page. The rhetorical critic has as his object the man before an audience giving a speech. It is true that some literary critics are concerned with knowing the author's intention, the character of his reading audience, the social milieu in which he lived and wrote, and its relation to the man and his work. Such factors, however, are often extrinsic to literary criticism; they are intrinsic with rhetorical criticism. As Wichelns points out, rhetorical criticism

> is not concerned with permanence, nor yet with beauty. It is concerned with effect. It regards speech as a communication to a specific audience, and holds its business to be the analysis and appreciation of the orator's method of imparting his ideas to his hearers.[3]

With this as his object, then, the man before an audience giving a speech, why is it that the rhetorical critic so often buries that object beneath a mound of well-documented but highly dull prose? Is it necessary, just because we are writing about someone who is dead, for our writing to be deadly?

This is not to suggest that the rhetorical critic rely on subjective evaluation, that he forego painstaking analysis of the speaker and his speeches. He should, however, hold to his business of analysis *and* appreciation, and one means of securing appreciation is to combine sound scholarship with good writing. The rhetorical critic needs to become more of a conscious craftsman, more of a creative artist in the use of his tools of expression.

[1] Frederick L. Allen, The Goon and His Style, *Harper's Magazine*, 144 (1921) 128.
[2] Ibid., 122.
[3] Herbert A. Wichelns, The Literary Criticism of Oratory, *Studies in Rhetoric and Public Speaking in Honor of James A. Winans* (New York, 1925) 209.

Let us not only demonstrate a knowledge of tropes and figures in our classification and counting and evaluation of their use by the speaker being studied; let us also demonstrate a knowledge of their use in our own writing. Let us not exhort our students to be clear, concise, and forceful in their use of language, and then ourselves get mired in muddied, vapid circumlocutions. Let us apply Stuart Pratt Sherman's test of 'aliveness' to our sense of language, for only by so doing can we bring to life the speaker giving his speech before his audience.

Not only are we guilty of writing deadly prose in rhetorical criticism, but in our concern for precision and accuracy in our dissection we seldom see the specimen as an organic unity. Our studies tend to be so compartmentalized that the speaker rarely comes to life as an entity; we seldom see the orator in action. It is inevitable that rhetorical studies must be broken down into considerations of logical, pathetic, and ethical proof, the audience, delivery, speech preparation, style, etc. From such disparate consideration, however, could we not, having made our separate observations, attempt to put Humpty-Dumpty back together again? There are studies in rhetorical criticism, although they are the exception to the rule, where the speaker and his speech are recreated in the audience situation in language that is colorful and forceful and alive. This has been achieved particularly in the treatment of Jonathan Edwards, Phillips Brooks, Wendell Phillips, Jeremiah S. Black, and Henry Clay in *A History and Criticism of American Public Address*.[4] It has been achieved, in spite of space limitations, in the treatment of Clay, Webster, and Calhoun in the *Literary History of the United States*.[5] It has also been achieved by writers with much less knowledge of the theory and methodology of rhetorical criticism. Consider one example from the area of reporting; this example comes from *The New Yorker*, a magazine that seldom appears in a footnote and then only to embarrass the editors. In 1947 Rebecca West wrote a searching account of the lynching trial in Greenville, South Carolina, in which she presents the following picture of one of the lawyers:

> Mr. Culbertson is a slender, narrow-chested man with a narrow head. His sparse hair is prematurely white, his nose is sharp, and his face is colorless except for his very pink lips. He wears rimless spectacles and his lashes are white. The backs of his hands are thickly covered with fine white hairs. In certain lights, he gives the impression of being covered with frost. . . . Mr. Culbertson belongs to the school of oratory that walks up and down in front of the jury box. At the climactic points of his speeches, he adopts a crouching stance, puts his hands out in front of him parallel to one another, and moves them in a rapid spin, as if he were a juggler and they were plates. Finally he shoots one hand forward and propels his argument with it. His choreography was especially vigorous when he was putting in a little work on the jury's possible prejudice against alcohol. He was attempting to discredit the evidence of the tourist-camp proprietor who had identified the alleged lynchers. His knees went down. "Doesn't this man"—his hands went forward—"own a honky-tonk . . . a camp"—his knees went lower; his hands came further forward—"where they sell"—his right hand shot out; his voice caught in his throat with horror and then cracked across space like a whip—"BEER"?[6]

I do not mean to imply that this is factually accurate to the degree that would satisfy the tenets of sound scholarship; there is indisputably much of the creative and the subjective in it. It does,

[4] *A History and Criticism of American Public Address*, ed. William Norwood Brigance (New York, 1943) 1.215-17, 311-13, 334-39, 460-67, 2.626-30.

[5] *Literary History of the United States*, ed. Robert E. Spiller, Willard Thorp, Thomas H. Johnson, Henry Seidel Canby (New York, 1948) 1.546-53.

[6] Rebecca West, Opera in Greenville, *The New Yorker*, 14 June 1947, 45-6; cf. Heil Hamm! *The New Yorker*, 7 August 1948, 24-45, 14 August 1948, 26-38.

however, give us a picture of the man before an audience giving a speech; it combines a consideration of content with the vocal and physical aspects of delivery in language that makes the speaker come alive. Would it not be possible for the rhetorical critic to add to his documentation some of the color and force and aliveness of this kind of writing? It is a blending of factual accuracy with linguistic imagery which the rhetorical critic should be so peculiarly fitted to achieve but so seldom does. Desmond MacCarthy once described oratory as 'a hothouse plant; an orchid that shrivels to an ignominious object in cool air.'[7] In our cool detachment as critics, in our necessary dispassion as scholars, the very object of criticism too often becomes sterile, colorless, and desiccated; our oatmeal is lumpy and lacks sufficient salt. There is no reason why it cannot have both substances and seasoning, why rhetorical criticism cannot combine sound scholarship with a concern for aliveness in language that will make the speaker being studied a real and vital unity.

S. Judson Crandell,
The State College of Washington

A COMMENT ON THE STATE REQUIREMENTS FOR SPEECH CORRECTIONISTS

When I read in the October issue the article by Sister Cyprian on Requirements for Speech Correctionists, I was struck by three lines of association that we may facetiously call ideas.

My first jolt was that four states of our capitalistic democracy known as the U.S.A. have stipulated that the requirements for speech correctionists shall be those set by the American Speech and Hearing Association. Now I have sat in on the council meetings in which these requirements have been set up. I have been aware of how unsure the council members have been that their decisions are wise and proper. I know that the council has been, and still is, feeling its way along a path that is poorly blazed and dimly lighted. But, none the less, here are four states who follow that leadership implicitly, and many others whose paths are through parallel canyons and over adjacent passes. That thought drives home to me the great responsibility of that leadership. If the pilgrims are following us, we must be especially careful not to lead them onto dangerous mountain sides or into desert valleys. It is a tribute to the prestige of the ASHA that this 'followership' exists; but followership without intelligent leadership is dangerous. We must therefore pray and strive for wisdom.

The second jolt to my cerebration comes from the impacts of the many references to fields of professional activity that a generation ago were talked about only by a few prophets who were 'voices crying in the wilderness.' In the days of yore all the speech correctionist was expected to be prepared to do was to 'correct' the *speech* of the children. Now we find that the correctionist may be asked to prepare himself in clinical psychology, remedial reading, hygiene, special education, electronics, acoustics, etc. I am glad that the field has extended itself. But, again, we face a caveat. In giving our soldiers a multiplicity of weapons, we must still let them know which are the principal instruments and which the supporting armamentaria. Further, we must not let the superintendents of schools get the notion that, because the speech correctionist knows mental testing for example, he can therefore be employed as a part-time psychologist. Such a use of the speech correctionist's time would bring credit neither to the profes-

[7] Desmond MacCarthy, *Experience* (New York, 1935) 304.

sion of speech correction nor that of psychometry.

The third observation that I have to offer as a result of reading this careful report is that it shows very clearly that hearing disorders are today regarded as speech disorders. Speech, apparently, involves the receiving apparatus as well as the broadcasting station. There are those among the earlier trained speech correctionists who resent and deplore this extension of the field of speech correction; but apparently it is an extension that is accepted by most states and required by many. Whether, therefore, we like it or not, we cannot avoid the responsibility of caring, not only for those whose articulation is defective because of impaired hearing, but also for those whose hearing is defective, whether or not the articulation is seriously disturbed.

These are my observations. Doubtless many other readers have made the same comments. Perhaps they are obvious. If they are, let's face them and react to their significance.

Robert W. West,
University of Wisconsin

MASS COMMUNICATIONS IN POST WAR BRITAIN: THE BBC

Giraud Chester has done an admirable job of reporting his thorough study in the October issue of the contributions of the British Broadcasting Corporation to the society which it serves. He has avoided one all-too-common practice of American scholars who have reported on the British system: that of conducting and reporting 'research' in a kind of semantic environment of either-orishness. Such work has lacked the objectivity and balance necessary to an understanding of the operation of the mass media of communication within the cultural framework of which they are such an important part. Too often we have been subjected to an almost hysterical denunciation of what has been viewed as hopelessly highbrow programming, or equally uncritical reactions of awe and reverence. Mr. Chester, however, has demonstrated on other occasions his ability to do an objective, scholarly, yet hard-hitting analysis. His case study of Irresponsibility on the Air, published in the *Public Opinion Quarterly*, Spring 1949, is an example.

The present report will be especially interesting to those of us who remember so vividly the days of Sir John Reith, the first director-general of the British Broadcasting Corporation. Sir John, unquestionably a capable and high-minded person, felt that he knew, not so much what the British people actually liked, but what they ought to like! While his essentially personal intellectual and cultural judgments were acceptable to many, their application as a mold into which the tastes of all British listeners had to be poured formed a singularly questionable design for a mass medium presumed to serve democratic ends. The elimination of popular music and comedy from the Sunday program schedule, for example, may be defensible, but only when eliminated on the basis of the freedom of the individual to engage actively in making the decision. The BBC was and is a monopoly, and if its director-general assumes that he can, without consultation, use this almost incredibly powerful communications medium in the one way which will be best for all listeners, even the finest programs will have a slightly authoritarian flavor. American students of the BBC, recognizing that freedom involves the responsibility of choice, will find Mr. Chester's article encouraging on this point.

This writer had the pleasure of listening to the BBC and working with some

of its personnel during the past year and was tremendously impressed with what he regards as an over-all democratization in its entire program structure.

Mr. Chester's comment about the impartiality and reserve of BBC newcasts is a familiar and well documented one, although the foreign affairs area has not always been treated quite so objectively. The work of Mr. Vernon Bartlett, a well-qualified analyst, is one example. Whether, as has been charged, Mr. Bartlett was elected to parliament on the basis of his broadcasts, is irrelevant to the issue. The BBC's objection to his preferred position' in giving expression to his own point of view, resulted in his eventual release from the Corporation. Charles Siepmann, a former staff member of the BBC and one of the great critics of American broadcasting, has pointed out that under the American system we would not have tolerated for so many years a one-man monopoly on the exposition of so vital a subject. Barbara Ward, a member of the Board of Governors of the British Broadcasting Corporation, has contended that some of the foreign broadcasting services in which the British way of life are extolled, are examples of what constitute essentially a preliminary to hostilities rather than to improved relations.

Professor Chester has, by implication, made a point which is somewhat more basic than many of the more fashionable criticisms currently being leveled against the American system. It is essentially, and in over-simplified form, this: that in any system in which our effort is to reach the largest possible audience at all times, we are likely to eliminate from our programming some of those important expressions of opinion which may alienate a substantial portion of that audience. If we agree that the road to social progress is paved with annoyances, irritations, and resistances, then the BBC appears to have tackled that problem somewhat more realistically than has the American radio.

It might be well to add, however, that I have heard many thoughtful Britishers say that they would welcome the creation of a number of BBC's. Their point is that if sufficient frequencies were available, self-competition and the reflection of regional influences would result in increased richness and freedom of choice in program fare.

I suppose that Professor Chester refers to serious music when he says that the BBC offers its listeners far more 'good' music than do the American networks. If so, we would all agree. In an academic discussion this writer would be inclined to raise some rather basic questions about what constitutes 'good' musical fare for a mass communications medium, despite his personal preference for BBC musical programming. In this instance, however, the reference is not likely to be misunderstood.

The freedom of the BBC to experiment with new techniques, as contrasted with what is assumed to be the rigid patterning of the American system, has in all probability been rather generally exaggerated, although not by the author. This writer remembers vividly being in attendance at a meeting at which Professor Chester asked Mr. Edward R. Murrow to comment on a similar criticism made by a program judge at the Institute for Education by Radio. The judge had expressed his disappointment that so few *new* developments had taken place in the techniques of presenting forum and discussion programs. Mr. Murrow replied that people had debated and discussed public issues of great concern for centuries, would probably continue to debate and discuss them, and that suggesting that they should stand on their

heads, or stand up and sit down simultaneously, would probably do little to increase either the effectiveness of the debate or its acceptability to the audience. The illustrations may beg the question, but it was Mr. Murrow's opinion that most of the practical variations of the forum technique had been tried, and that most of the best of them were represented in the present American program structure somewhere along the line. This writer is in no position to pass judgment on that comment, but his experience in experimental public service programming leads him to react negatively to thoughtless and captious criticism, some of which, at least, appears to be based upon the assumption that previously untried *techniques* must have some peculiar inherent virtue, simply *because* they have been untried.

The careful reader will find that Professor Chester's article makes available some of the desirable as well as undesirable apects of the widely misunderstood British system. He does not propose the wholesale adoption of that system here. Many of those who have supported such a super-imposition have neglected even the most elementary consideration of frequency limitations and geographic differences, and have bowed only casually and in passing to the vast though possibly decreasing cultural differences between the two nations. The BBC obviously is doing an excellent job for the British people; we would be myopic indeed if we were to fail to recognize it, and refuse to profit from the examples of effective programming outlined in that article.

Professor Chester has done a service to the BBC, the American broadcasting industry, and to the academically oriented reader.

E. W. Ziebarth,
University of Minnesota

A NEW BIBLIOGRAPHY ON RADIO AND TELEVISION

The U. S. Office of Education has published a *Radio and Television Bibliography* which should prove very helpful to high school and college teachers of radio courses. The 33 page, neatly printed and indexed bibliography was prepared by Gertrude G. Broderick; it can be obtained from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., for 15 cents. The contents include listings of general readings on radio (over 100 titles), and sections concerned with radio careers, broadcasting techniques and script writing, educational applications, lists of scripts, books, and plays for radio. Publications in technical fields are covered in sections on engineering, FM, television, and recording equipment. A short listing of periodicals in radio and television, and sources of general information about radio complete the bibliography.

Clear and concise annotations accompany most entries; titles are identified complete with the mailing addresses of lesser known or private publishers. In comparison with other published bibliographies, such as Rose's *Radio Broadcasting and Television* (H. W. Wilson, 1947, $1.50), this pamphlet seems quite as adequate for elementary purposes, and it is certainly much cheaper. Miss Broderick has done an especially good job in making a convenient assemblage of the pamphlets and publications put out by private groups and committees, but I think she might have included the number of pages in each item to give some indication of their possible importance.

No magazine or scholarly articles, except those which have been published separately, are included. Their blanket omission is, I think, unfortunate. In dealing with radio and education, the compiler has included many valuable

and less well-known titles, but, strangely, has omitted such an important historical work as S. E. Frost, Jr.'s, *Education's Own Stations*. Another weakness is the coverage of government and radio. Thus, while I found the FCC's *Standards of Good Engineering Practice* and *An ABC of the FCC*, I could not find two major FCC documents of recent years, the *Report on Chain Broadcasting* and *Public Service Responsibilities of Broadcast Licensees*. Furthermore, it would seem wise for a bibliography to include such important government documents as, for example, the hearings before the White Subcommittee on Senate bill 1333 (1947), and other such hearings on matters of public policy and radio, which are indispensable to any serious student engaged in research on American radio.

Within its limitations, however, the bibliography is well executed and is a very worthwhile government project in radio education. Teachers of radio would be well advised to obtain Miss Broderick's handy pamphlet.

GIRAUD CHESTER,
Queens College

WE NEED AN ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF RADIO

I have read with a great deal of interest the article by Harry Williams in the October issue dealing with the teaching of radio. Of course I heard the same views expressed at the SAA meeting here in Washington during the Christmas holidays, but I think they bear reiteration.

The comment that I would like to make on the present situation is this: that in my opinion and considered judgment, those of us who are in radio and its affiliated field should get together in one strong association similar, for instance, to the Music Educator's National Conference of which I am proud to be a founder.

This association, once organized, would provide the means of setting up standard courses of study in the same manner that we have accomplished them for music. On the basis then of what *can* be taught by radio in the classroom, we would be able to develop standard courses of study for the teaching of utilization. From the knowledge gained in planning and building programs we would be able to bring the weight of our experience to bear upon standardized courses in teaching the organization of such creative effort. Out of all these we could develop a standard course in administration.

When I think of standard courses my own mind becomes willing to accept minimum requirements with a wide latitude for development of individual capacity and the use of a wide range of native talent and imagination possessed by every successful teacher.

FRANKLIN DUNHAM, *Chief of Radio U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D. C.*

SOME COMMITTEE PROGRESS REPORTS

STUDIES IN AMERICAN SPEECH EDUCATION

Plans have virtually been completed for the preparation of a volume devoted to studies in the backgrounds of speech education in America from colonial times to about 1921. Twenty-eight articles have been projected and authors for twenty-two of them have agreed to submit final manuscripts no later than September 1, 1951. A few authors will have completed their studies much earlier. Three commercial publishers and two university presses have expressed interest in the volume.

Although a list of the titles of the essays is too long to include in this brief

report, readers will be interested to learn of the authors who have agreed to write:

A. C. Baird
Ernest Bavely
G. P. Bohman
Gladys Borchers and D. K. Smith
J. F. Curtis
C. W. Edney
G. W. Gray
Warren Guthrie
F. W. Haberman
L. L. Hale
W. P. Halstead
Hubert Heffner
J. P. Hoshor
W. S. Howell
C. V. Hudgins
Wendell Johnson
F. M. Rarig and H. S. Greaves
Edyth Renshaw
Mary M. Robb
C. L. Shaver
Hugh Seabury
C. K. Thomas

THE EDITORIAL BOARD

F. W. Haberman
B. W. Hewitt
Warren Guthrie
Harold Westlake
C. M. Wise
K. R. Wallace, *Chairman*

KARL R. WALLACE,
University of Illinois

CONTEMPORARY AMERICAN PUBLIC ADDRESS

The aims of this Committee, as their activities have been reported, include 1. the investigation of 'the advisability of securing a central headquarters for the collection and study of contemporary speech materials,' 2. exploring the 'possibility of securing a grant from outside sources in order to carry out its work,' 3. continuing the 'collection of recordings, scripts, and collateral materials on contemporary public address,' 4. case studies of typical or significant speech occasions of the present year, 5. the encouragement of research, other than that suggested above, in present-day American public address, 6. the continued encouragement of published articles similar to those in the QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH in 1948, and 7. perhaps with a view to the further classroom study of contemporary American public address, the exploration of courses or units of instruction that have attempted systematic treatment of such area.

This committee has engaged in considerable correspondence in an attempt to establish a 'central headquarters' for speech archives; libraries have been contacted for such cooperation; and the possibilities of having the SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA serve as such filing agency continue to be explored.

Information concerning recordings and scripts has been solicited from more than one hundred college instructors in public address. Each member of the ASSOCIATION is invited to report to the chairman any recordings or speeches under his jurisdiction that may be made available for study.

A list of case studies has been made, and a systematic program for investigation in representative types of address attempted. Research projects have been compiled for distribution. A report of college courses that deal with contemporary public address is being assembled.

LELAND CHAPIN,
Stanford University

WALTER EMERY,
Federal Communications Commission

BARNET BASKERVILLE,
University of Washington

WILLIAM BEHL,
Brooklyn College

HARRISON SUMMERS,
Ohio State University

ERNEST WRAGE,
Northwestern University

LIONEL CROCKER,
Denison University

A. CRAIG BAIRD, *Chairman*
State University of Iowa

BIOGRAPHICAL STUDIES

The Committee in charge of editing Volume III of *The History and Criticism of American Public Address* has spent the past year in securing writers for each

of the studies to be included. The writers and their subjects are as follows:

Susan B. Anthony	Doris Yoakam Twichell, *DeKalb, Illinois*
William E. Borah	Alfred E. Whitehead, *University of Idaho*
Clarence Darrow	Martin Maloney, *Northwestern University*
Dwight L. Moody	Robert Huber, *University of Vermont*
Harry Emerson Fosdick	Robert D. Clark *University of Oregon*
Theodore Roosevelt	Richard Murphy *University of Illinois*
Franklin D. Roosevelt	Earnest Brandenburg, *Washington University* and Waldo Braden, *Louisiana State University*
Lucius Q. C. Lamar	Dallas Dickey, *University of Florida*
Thomas Hart Benton	Norman Mattis, *University of North Carolina*
George William Curtis	Carroll Arnold, *Cornell University*

W. Norwood Brigance,
Wabash College
Donald Bryant,
Washington University
Marie Hochmuth, *Chairman*
University of Illinois

INTERNATIONAL DEBATING

Two teams from Cambridge University toured the United States during the spring of 1949 and an Oxford University team debated in the Eastern United States in the fall of 1949. During the spring of 1950, a team from the Scottish universities will visit the Western United States, and an American team, one debater from the University of Alabama and one from Bates College, will go to Great Britain.

Your committee has worked in close cooperation with the Institute of International Education. As a result of this cooperation, certain principles have been established as follows:

1. Visiting teams shall be carefully selected and their topics approved by the committee.
2. When a choice has to be made, the institution or territory more recently visited shall give way to an institution or territory not so recently visited.
3. Colleges and universities should have precedence over other organizations in obtaining engagements with visiting teams.
4. In order to provide a maximum of debating for a minimum of expenditure the itineraries shall be compact, both as to territory and time.
5. The visitors shall be on an expense basis with any surplus revenue used to take care of deficits of other visits here or to assist in sending teams abroad.
6. Since the British prefer to entertain only a limited number of teams, they will look to the committee for approval of any teams requesting engagements in Great Britain.
7. When funds can be secured to assist teams going abroad, the committee will put into operation a plan of individual selection on a national basis.
8. In the meantime, nominations, either individual or team, for teams going abroad must be accompanied by an agreement to pay the expenses of the nominee or nominees and will be judged on the basis of the record of the individual and the institution.

In the spring of 1949 we sent out form letters to more than three hundred institutions known to be interested in debate. This letter explained the present set-up of the activity and called for nominations for debaters to go abroad and for requests for engagements with visiting teams. From now on itineraries will be arranged for visiting teams to different sections of the country in rotation or as

there is demand and they will not be set up till institutions showing interest in the section have been given an opportunity to request an engagement. The present fee for each engagement is $100 and local entertainment. The itineraries of the Oxford and Scottish teams and the selection of the Alabama and Bates debaters to form a combined team to go to Great Britain next spring are the direct result of this letter.

In order to put into effect a more elaborate method of national individual selection which has been worked out, the committee feels that more financial aid should be secured for teams going abroad. To that end, the committee is now attempting to secure financial aid from the United States Government under the Fulbright Act, or from private foundations. Many of the decisions thus far made by the committee have been at the suggestion of directors of debate at various institutions; further such suggestions on any of the problems of the committee will be welcomed.

JOHN NEALE,
Dartmouth College
RICHARD MURPHY,
University of Illinois
GLEN MILLS,
Northwestern University
BROOKS QUIMBY, *Chairman*
Bates College

INTERCOLLEGIATE DEBATE AND DISCUSSION

The committee on intercollegiate debate and discussion is charged with the responsibility for the selection and use of single topics in the fields of intercollegiate debate and discussion. Each year this committee carries out its work within the framework of a plan of procedure adopted by the cooperating organizations. Each of the following honor societies has two representatives: Delta Sigma Rho, Thorrel B. Fest and W. S. Howell; Tau Kappa Alpha, T. Earle Johnson and P. Merville Larson; Phi Rho Pi, H. B. Mitchell and Paul W. Smith; Pi Kappa Delta, Glenn R. Capp and Theodore F. Nelson. The SAA is represented by Lionel Crocker. The present committee was organized in March and solicited suggestions from over five hundred directors of forensics. Over one hundred topics were submitted for consideration. The five most popular subject areas were submitted to all institutions for preferential vote. These ballots were tabulated in June and the committee turned to the task of wording the specific topics. A special sub-committee met in July and submitted recommendations to the entire committee which voted by mail for preferred wordings. The members agreed upon the following statements: In discussion the question will be: *What should be the foreign policy of the United States towards the Countries of the Orient?* The debate proposition is: *Resolved, that the United States should nationalize the Basic Non-agricultural Industries.*

The procedure is in the process of revision and awaits official action by all of the organizations concerned.

PAUL W. SMITH, *Chairman*
Pasadena City College

THE NATIONAL DISCUSSION FOUNDATION

The Committee on the National Discussion Foundation is in the process of reorganizing and readapting itself in order to provide some practical service to the Association. The following report represents the activities of the Committee during the past year.

1. The Committee was represented on the staff of the National Training Laboratory in Group Development in Bethel, Maine, during June and July,

1949. The results of this experience are being brought together in the form of reports and recommendations to the SAA for further study of the work of the Bethel group.

2. A special meeting of the Committee and of all persons interested in Discussion problems in research has been called for Tuesday, 27 December, 1949 at the national convention. This meeting is for the purpose of considering the work of the foundation and of planning a program for the coming year. *All persons interested in discussion research and development are invited to attend this meeting.*

3. We are now exploring the possibilities of organizing a series of collaborative studies of discussion and group methods. This collaboration will involve the combined resources and personnel of several national and regional groups and of interested universities.

4. The Committee offered to develop a workshop conference in group methods to be held at the national convention. The proposal for this year was laid aside because previous plans were held in precedence. We hope to stimulate further interest in this type of program for the 1950 SAA convention and the 1950 Central States Speech Association meeting.

5. A survey of college discussion programs in curricular and extra-curricular activities is being prepared and will be conducted during the latter part of 1949 and early 1950.

6. We are investigating the possibility of reporting completed research in discussion and work in progress.

JOHN W. KELTNER,
University of Oklahoma

UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES

The following preliminary statement represents the first explorations of the committee into its assignment.

I. Function: The primary attention of the committee should be given to the whole speech program in the undergraduate college (Thus limited, the committee should not conflict with other committees which attend the same field).

II. Problems which properly should come to the attention of the committee:
   1. The place of speech in the college curriculum—especially, its relation to liberal arts.
   2. Required speech courses: should there be such courses? If so, under what circumstances? required of whom? etc.
   3. What should constitute a major in speech?
   4. What should be the relationship of the various phases of speech training (public address, drama, radio, speech correction) in departmental organization? in the student's major?
   5. What functions can and should a speech major serve (other than vocational preparation)? (The answer here, of course, will have some bearing on #3, above).
   6. What should we regard as proper professional qualifications for the college teacher of speech?
   7. Into what area of institutional organization should a department of speech be placed? Liberal Arts? Fine Arts? Professional School?

III. Procedure of Committee:
   1. Through correspondence and consultation (and use of available studies) to recognize and define the problems of the undergraduate program in speech. This is not a job which can be done once and dismissed, but one which must be repeated periodically.
   2. To collect data on institutional attempts to solve the problems which have been set forth above. This may be done in some part by graduate students.
   3. To encourage various graduate schools to undertake the study of some of the problems outlined by the committee.
   4. Through correspondence and consultation to evaluate, periodically, various attempts to meet the problems set forth above. (This, of course, is the most

difficult of the tasks, but needs very much to be done). These evaluations may be set forth in mimeographed reports to the Association and, perhaps, in an occasional article for the Journal.

It is recommended that the committee be enlarged to contain at least seven members, and that appointments be made with some recognition of different types of undergraduate schools.

Aside from the last item above, the committee recommends that this report, preliminary as it is, be simply received and filed and made available to interested committees of the Association.

DAVID C. PHILLIPS,
University of Connecticut
ROBERT B. HUBER,
University of Vermont
P. MERVILLE LARSON,
University of Denver
ROBERT D. CLARK, *Chairman*
University of Oregon

PROBLEMS IN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES

The Committee, still relatively young, has spent the year in exploring its field of responsibility in order to determine:

1. What the nature of the Committee ought to be, in relation to
   a. theological seminaries
   b. colleges and universities with divinity schools
   c. other institutions wherein students are prepared for the ministry
2. What the work of the Committee ought to be, in relation to
   a. the annually-scheduled sectional program
   b. the preparation of articles for the QJS
   c. the compilation of a roster of teachers of speech-for-preachers
   d. the establishment of rapport with administrators of institutions for the preparation of preachers
   e. the determination of the goals for attainment by theological students on the pre-seminary and the seminary levels
   f. the materials and methods of attaining the goals on each level
   g. the encouragement of graduate research in speech education for preachers, as regards homiletics and as regards 'straight' speech
   h. the literature of the field.

As steps in the exploratory process, the Committee has engaged in considerable correspondence, has held two rather long conferences, and has lent encouragement to the pursuit of a project having to do with 'the types of speech training best suited to the level of seminary training,' and with the definition of the areas of content for speech teachers in the seminaries—whether the emphasis should be upon '*homiletics* or just the technical aspects of *composition* and *delivery*.'

The present Committee is undertaking to complete, and to prepare for publication, a digest of the survey that was undertaken two years ago. The survey includes topics relative to personnel, and to materials and methods used in the training of preachers. However, the Committee needs time, and requests the privilege of further exploration, before it is prepared to engage in the mechanics of the extended survey. At the same time, it is actively engaged in the task of advertising and promoting the ASSOCIATION among preachers and teachers-of-preachers.

CHARLES A. MCGLON,
Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

PROBLEMS IN RADIO

During the past year the radio committee has devoted its attention to three areas of research. Hale Aarnes assumed responsibility for a survey of the preparation and training of existing personnel engaged in radio instruction. Armand Hunter undertook to investigate the nature of the second year course in this subject area. While Harry M. Williams has attempted to investigate the content and organization of the first year course. The results of these three

separate studies will be gathered together in the annual report to the Executive Committee at the Chicago convention.

In addition to these basic projects the committee has attempted to develop its relationship to other groups devoted to similar goals in order to insure cooperation among all concerned. It has attempted to serve individual members of SAA wherever correspondence could be of help in solving problems. And finally, in July the committee approached the Secretary of the Federal Communications Commission with certain suggestions regarding the possibility of the Commission altering its procedures in the technical regulations for 10 watt FM operation. Evidence indicated that certain changes might improve working conditions of some college FM stations. A hearing was scheduled by the Commission for October 10th. Cooperating with other groups in promoting the suggestions, the committee presented to the Commission its statement of approval of the proposed alterations. It is hoped the committee will be able to report more favorable operating conditions in 10 watt FM installations by the time of the convention.

HALE AARNES,
Stephens College
ARMAND HUNTER,
Temple University
HARRY M. WILLIAMS, *Chairman*
Miami University

COMMUNICATIONS

The members of the Committee on Problems in Communications agreed that there was a need for a comprehensive and systematic survey of the communications programs which have existed, are now functioning, and are being projected in the colleges and universities throughout the United States since there seems to be little similarity in the objectives or the methods of attaining those objectives in these programs labeled Communications. Furthermore, no one is quite sure what the trend of this movement is in the United States.

The following colleges and universities, selected because they conduct communications programs, were visited by members of this committee: H. P. Constans of the University of Florida reported on Florida State University, the University of Florida and the University of North Carolina; Ralph Nichols of the University of Minnesota, Department of Agriculture, reported on Michigan State College, the University of Minnesota, the State University of Iowa, and Stephens College; D. Paul McKelvey of Stanford University reported on the University of Southern California, San Francisco State College, The City College of San Francisco and Whittier College; Franklin Knower is reporting on Muskingum College; and I am reporting on the University of Denver.

In each institution, the following questions were asked:

What students take the course, why do they take it, and how many are enrolled?
What are the objectives?
What are the methods used in reaching these objectives?
What prompted the launching of the program?
What changes have taken place in this Communications Program? Why?
What do the administrators, teachers and students consider as strengths and weaknesses of the program?
What other sources of evaluation have been used and what evidence was found?
What obstacles are being encountered in the administration of this program?
If the program died, what were the causes?

The Committee is studying these reports, attempting to determine the similarities in them. We hope to submit whatever significant conclusions are reached, with recommendations for fur-

ther action, to the Executive Council of the Association by December 1, 1949.

WESLEY WIKSELL,
Louisiana State University

PROBLEMS OF MICROFILM AND MICROCARD MATERIALS

At the 1948 SAA convention, the Council authorized a committee on Problems of Microfilm and Microcard Materials. The committee has been studying the need for such photographic reproductions of books, pamphlets, and manuscripts, to increase facilities for research in the libraries extensively utilized in graduate study in speech. Since the war, a number of projects in literature, governmental documents, economics, and languages have been set up on a subscription basis by learned societies working with agencies equipped to do microfilm and microcard work. In general, a subscription of fifty libraries is considered necessary to hold down the costs of the positive film or card to each library. The cost depends upon such factors as the size of the list, total pages, and the location of copies that can be photographed. The cost of positive copies alone is quite low.

After preliminary discussion of the needs of the speech field, the committee decided to explore in detail a project for microfilming a selected list of British and Continental works on rhetoric and elocution of which few or no copies are available in American libraries. Beginning with selections from the well known bibliographies of Sandford and Wallace, the committee is revising a preliminary list with the assistance of numerous members of the ASSOCIATION who are well acquainted with this field. The committee hopes to present a fairly clearly defined project to the Council at the 1949 convention.

Any members of the ASSOCIATION who have an interest in this project or in other projects that may be outlined are urged to write to the committee: George V. Bohman, Wayne University, chairman. A general discussion of the usefulness of photographed materials will be included in the sectional meeting on library facilities and research on the afternoon of December 29.

GEORGE V. BOHMAN,
Wayne University

CORRECTIONS

In the article by Professor Frederick George Marcham on History and Speech: Collaborative Studies, Present and Future appearing in the October issue, it was announced that the author had presented the material originally at the Eastern Public Speaking Conference in New York in April, 1949. The announcement should have read: 'at the convention of the Speech Association of America in Washington in December 1948.'

In the article by Giraud Chester, How Good is British Radio?, the second sentence in the first new paragraph on page 326 should read: 'Employees are *not* on civil service and have no tenure, but employment policies are much like those of government service.'

NEW BOOKS IN REVIEW

DOUGLAS EHNINGER, *Editor*

EXPERIMENTS ON MASS COMMUNICATION. By Carl I. Hovland, Arthur A. Lumsdaine, and Fred D. Sheffield. (Volume III of *Studies in Social Psychology in World War II*) Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1949; pp. x+345. $5.00.

At first glance, the United States Army would not seem to be an ideal place to study the effects of mass communication. For one thing an investigator might wonder whether his results could be projected to the civilian population. On the other hand, the Army knows the exact size and stratification of the universe it is studying and more about the individual members of that universe than any experimenter can hope to know about the civilian universe; furthermore, it can control its population in a way no civilian experimenter could control the civilian population. And during the last war the Army had certain special needs and facilities for studying the effects of communications. In its orientation and training films, it had official communications intended to produce specific effects which could be measured and needed to be measured. To make these measurements it had the good sense to bring a group of excellent social scientists into the Research Branch of its Information and Education Division. This book has grown out of the work of that Research Branch.

It is an important book in the development of communications study—not because its conclusions are earth-shaking, but because it presents the results of carefully designed and controlled experiments in an area which has usually been ruled by thumb and theory.

The experimenters worked with two kinds of films: orientation films like the 'Why We Fight' series which were supposed to teach certain facts about the war, but chiefly to induce favorable attitudes in the men who saw the pictures; and training films, on such subjects as map reading, where the learning of facts was more important than the forming of attitudes and opinions. In both cases, it was found that a high degree of learning took place. The results of these experiments will not displease the most enthusiastic advocates of teaching films. But the learning that took place was chiefly of factual items. There was no great increment of attitudes and opinions, even in such orientation films as 'The Battle of Britain' which were specifically designed to teach attitudes. In fact, the learning of attitudes was so disappointing as to cast doubt on the fundamental assumption of the Army orientation program, which was that men who are given more information about the war will develop more favorable attitudes toward our participation in the war.

Why should this discrepancy exist between the learning of facts and the forming of attitudes from mass communications? If we can answer that question we can say a great deal about the nature of communication effects.

One partial answer occurs at once. These films were a very small part of the war-related experience of their audiences. Therefore, the films had to con-

tend, in 50 minutes or so, with attitudes deeply documented and ingrained. Furthermore, the attitudes which the films were trying to teach were probably held by the great majority of Americans, and the films were therefore trying to change the attitude of a minority. The deviant minority may be harder to change; it may cling more tenaciously to its opinions. But two other findings of these investigators point to somewhat newer hypotheses of great importance.

For one thing, it was found that general attitudes were less likely to be learned than specific ones. If the desired opinion was specifically stated and taught in the film, there was considerable effect in that direction on the audience. On the other hand, if the desired opinion or attitude had to be implied by the audience from facts given in the film, then there was so little effect as to suggest that only a few persons are able to work in terms of the *implications* of mass communication. The obvious hypothesis is that transference does not take place, in the great majority of cases, unless the transferrable material is specifically covered and stated in the communication. Or in simpler words, if you want to persuade an audience through mass communications, don't count on them to infer what you want them to believe; tell them specifically, and tell them why, and leave nothing to inference.

Another hypothesis was suggested when the investigators studied the retention of facts and attitudes. Retention of facts followed the expected curve of forgetting; that is, the most facts were remembered immediately after the film, and the number decreased steadily thereafter. The investigators were somewhat surprised, however, to find that no such curve of forgetting applied to attitudes and opinions. In fact, there was actually *more* change in attitude after nine weeks than after one week. This agrees with F. C. Bartlett's findings that learning tends to be modified by time in the direction of forgetting all but the general content, and to be modified in the direction of introducing new material which agrees with the individual's original attitudes toward the content. It suggests that as facts slip away, general conclusions tend to emerge, and that a 'sinking in' period may be necessary for the maximum persuasive effects of communication. The timing of persuasive communication is therefore of great importance, and it is something of which we know little.

In general, these investigators found that the most constant correlate of learning from films was intellectual ability, whether measured by educational attainment or by the Army General Classification Tests. Whether the material was easy or hard, the persons with greater intellectual ability learned more and were more likely to make valid interpretations. The surprising thing about these findings is the linearity of relationship—the fact that the ratio between amounts learned was about the same for the two groups of men, whether the material was hard or easy.

Comparing film strips with motion pictures, the investigators found that about as much learning took place—at least in this particular instance—from one as from the other. Comparing commentator programs with dramatic programs, they were likewise unable to say that one was clearly more effective than the other, although an important by-product of this study was the discovery that supplementing a film either by a short introduction or a short review considerably increased the effect of the film presentation. Neither the introduction nor the review was found to be clearly superior to the other. Audience participation, where possible,

was found to be a valuable aid in the learning process—for example, practicing words during a film on reading skill. For maximum learning, say the writers of this book, 'the actual response to be learned should be actively practiced during the film showing.' If that is not possible, 'appropriate symbolic responses should be practiced.' The film should 'as nearly as possible duplicate . . . the stimulus situation in which the audience members later will be expected to perform the responses to be learned.'

Pictures of a narrator speaking were found usually to attract little audience interest; but when shots of action were used to illustrate what the commentator was describing, then interest rose markedly. Television producers and educational film makers will note this. It was also found that the persons who most liked a film were usually the ones in whom most learning took place; but which of these elements was cause, which effect, could not be determined.

The relative effectiveness of presenting one or both sides of a controversial argument was studied at some length. In general, better educated men were more favorably affected by presentation of both sides; less well educated men, by using only supporting arguments. The group for whom two-sided presentation was least effective was the group of poorly educated men who were already convinced of the point being advocated. Men who were initially opposed to the point of view being advocated were more favorably affected by presenting both sides. In this case, however, it is necessary to be scrupulously fair in the presentation; if an opposing argument is omitted or slighted, the result will boomerang.

In a comment on their own method, the authors of this book noted that 'the most useful practical conclusions arose from the few studies designed and executed to answer more general scientific and "long-range" questions rather than from studies that were fostered for the purpose of giving answers to "immediate, practical problems."' That is true for any area of knowledge in which the general principles are not established. As natural scientists in the last war showed what could be done with the basic theory of nuclear fission and wave propagation, so these social scientists have given us a glimpse of what can be done by attacking the basic theory of communication. We need the readership, listenership, readability, and public opinion measurements which we have now in abundance, but far more we need studies like this intelligent and lucid book which will penetrate to basic principles and tell us what some of our readership, listenership, readability, and public opinion studies really mean.

WILBUR SCHRAMM, *Director*
Institute of Communications,
University of Illinois

SPEECH OF OUR TIME. Edited by Clive Sansom. London: Hinrichsen, 1948; pp. 228. $4.50.

The publisher of this British symposium offers it as 'the first attempt that has been made at a comprehensive survey of speech in this country. It considers the vast opportunities opened up by recent mechanical inventions, the position of speech in education and modern life, and in the arts of poetry and drama. Every article has been written by an expert in that particular department.'

Divided into seven sections, titled successively Science and Speech, Speech Societies, Speech Education, Training, The Art of Speech, English Speech Abroad, and Speech Therapy, the volume attempts to cover the present status of speech in thirty-odd brief essays. The contributors include such writers as Dennis Fry, Marjorie Gullan, Roger Manvell, and numerous teachers of speech. The essays are, for the most part, pretty thin; they will disappoint the serious student who seeks detailed information on speech in Britain. Indeed, it is far from

clear for what audience the symposium was intended. It should be said, however, that the book does draw a panoramic view of the speech enterprise in England, with its shortcomings discussed explicitly or made self-evident to the American reader by remarkable omissions.

The English conception of speech seems rather heavily weighted on the side of phonetics, drama, and poetry reading, although most aspects are covered in some fashion or other. In the section titled The Art of Speech, for example, we find essays on Spoken Poetry, Verse Speaking Today, Choral Speaking, Speech Festivals, Speech in Our Theatre, Amateur and Experimental Drama, Speech and Song, Public Speaking (a good three-and-a-half page discussion, the only one on the subject in the book), and The Use of the Voice in Church.

What will probably interest most American readers is the section on Speech Education which details the recognition (or lack of recognition) of speech training by the Ministry of Education and the schools and universities of the country. In 1921, it appears, an official educational publication, called *The Teaching of English in England*, made the point that 'It is the first duty of the elementary school to give its pupils speech.' In 1943, the official Norwood Report postulated 'clear expression in English, both spoken and written, based on the logical arrangement of ideas' as a primary element in education. And as recently as 1944, the McNair report on *Teachers and Youth Leaders* recommended that 'the Board of Education should require every training institution to pay attention to the speech of every student, and every area training authority to include in the assessment of a student's practical teaching ability to use the English language.' Nevertheless, the impression one gets from reading these essays is that the speech people are having to put up a tough up-hill fight to advance speech education. M. M. Lewis, one of the contributors, calls for a 'Department of Spoken Language devoted both to teaching and research' in every university, pointing out that there are now only two such departments in Britain, and both of them are mainly concerned with phonetics. Clive Sansom, editor of the volume, writes in an opening survey that 'Nowhere does the criticism that the Universities are out of touch with modern life seem more justified than in their attitude to the spoken language.'

One would judge that speech training in Britain, in terms of breadth of conception and acceptance by educational administrators, is about a generation behind the American scene, with a few exceptions in specialized fields. The pleas of the writers for recognition by the universities takes us back to the incubational days of the National Association of Teachers of Speech. What is perhaps even more disturbing, however, is the failure of the British speech leaders to appreciate the scope of the speech field, or even, I would judge, to be informed of the shape the field has assumed in this country. Particularly in the area of public address does the conception fall short. Bibliographic listings include American sources, but they are clearly inadequate and occasionally inaccurate. It would seem that we have here an important area for trans-atlantic exchange of information and probably a worthwhile educational project, comprising a teacher-exchange arrangement or a research and consulting enterprise.

GIRAUD CHESTER,
Queens College

AN INDEX TO ARISTOTLE. By Troy Wilson Organ. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1948; pp. vi+181. $5.00.

Students of public address and the drama have long been aware that much good Aristotelian theory on these topics is found in treatises other than the *Rhetoric* and the *Poetics*. The *Index* does the reader of the JOURNAL the great service of helping him to locate specific references in all of the principal writings of Aristotle.

Professor Organ's handling of the topic *enthymeme* gives a fair idea of the usefulness of his work. The nearly ninety entries under this heading occupy about a column and a half in the book. Most of the references are, of course, to the *Rhetoric;* the particular usefulness of the *Index* to the student of rhetorical criticism, however, would be to point out comments about the enthymeme in Aristotle's other treatises. A few such entries appear, as follows:

70a3: 'Now an enthymeme is a syllogism starting from probabilities or signs . . . ' from *Prior Analytics.*

71a10: 'An enthymeme is a form of syllogism . . .' from *Posterior Analytics.*

701a25-39: '. . . as in some cases of speculative inquiry we suppress a premise . . .' from *On the Generation of Animals.*

916b25-34: 'Why is it that in rhetorical displays men prefer examples and fables rather than enthymemes? Is it because they like to learn and to learn quickly, and this end is achieved more easily by examples and fables, since these are familiar to them and are of the

nature of particulars, whereas enthymemes are proofs based on generalities, with which we are less familiar than with the particular? . . .' from *Problemata*.

Further light on the enthymeme may, of course, be found by looking under such related topics as *probability* (26 entries), *sign* (22 entries), and *syllogism* (58 entries).

Professor Organ's compilation will be of substantial help to the serious writer on rhetorical topics.

LOREN D. REID,
University of Missouri

THE PREPARATION OF SERMONS. By A. W. Blackwood. New York and Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1948; pp. 272. $3.00.

PREACHING AND THE DRAMATIC ARTS. By E. Winston Jones. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1948; pp. ix+123. $2.00.

If preaching has been one of the four recognized avenues down which the great tradition of American public address has developed, then the teaching of preaching should merit careful attention from students of all educational theory and practice. Moreover, if preaching is a kind of speaking and speaking is a part of preaching, then textbooks dealing with preaching should be of particular interest to teachers of speech. Furthermore, in proportion as the nature of preaching or of other kinds of religious address is extended in any direction, so as to include elements of the speech arts and sciences, teachers in these specialized areas should find their interest and their efforts challenged. Because the foregoing assumptions have gained increasing support from both religious and secular groups, the horizons of preaching are being extended, and the potential service of teachers of speech is being enhanced.

The difficulty with textbooks that make specialized approaches to the study of preaching is that in religious address, perhaps more than in any other type of human activity, theory and practice are nearly inseparable. For this reason, the title of Dr. Blackwood's book appears on first glance to deal with only half of the problem at hand. How can one study the preparation of sermons apart from the delivery of sermons? This question is a basic one that constantly asserts itself in the curriculum of specialized theological education. It raises other questions also: Can one study the 'how' of preaching without studying the 'what' of preaching? Should one study the 'what,' then the 'how,' or should he study the two aspects together? Can he study either the 'what' or the 'how' successfully without due regard also for the 'who,' the 'why,' the 'when,' and the 'where'? Of course, such questions are not peculiar to theological education: they produce almost insurmountable obstacles in all kinds of professional education which have to do with speaking. But the questions are so constantly and so exasperatingly present in the preparation of religious speakers, that some educators have concluded preaching cannot be taught.

Dr. Blackwood, writer of many books on preachers and preaching, believes that 'anyone who ought to become a minister can learn how to preach.' Furthermore, he seeks to answer some of the aforementioned questions by extending his treatment of the study of preaching beyond earlier limitations. That is to say, in the present volume, he deals with *the preparation for the pulpit* rather than with the more restricted subjects of the theory of preaching, the composition of sermons, the delivery of sermons, the rhetoric of sermons, the psychology of preaching, the personality of the preacher, the science of homiletics, or the art of preaching. Never discounting the importance of any one of the restricted subjects, however, the author presents twenty-four lectures on as many topics, and generously illustrates each principle with examples or excerpts from model sermons to help the student-reader comprehend the relationship of all the *parts* of the study of preaching to each other and to the student's own output of religious discourse. In taking this approach to the problem, Dr. Blackwood makes his volume exceedingly practical for the student-preacher, who, 'like every artist—learns best by doing, provided he always preaches as well as he can.'

Whereas Dr. Blackwood's book appears at first to be a partial study, but proves to be actually a treatment of many aspects of a large problem, Dr. Jones' book appears to be an attempt to relate two very large fields of communication, but proves to be actually a limited approach to the study of religious discourse. Although Dr. Jones writes with authority, from a background in both preaching and dramatic art, he dwells largely upon preaching alone rather than upon preaching *and* the dramatic arts. Holding that preaching is not drama and that the preacher is not an actor, he contends that the preacher must employ dramatic techniques to make the religious message meaningful and influential. He succeeds in persuad-

ing the reader that preaching will be vital if the preacher-artist gives due attention to such elements as movement, emotion, impression, selectivity, and symbolism. But the real value of Dr. Jones' work lies not so much in his contribution of anything new for preaching or for dramatic art, as in his rather brief presentation of the psycho-psychological principles that are applicable to preaching. Therefore, if one is not familiar with such standard homiletical references as Broadus' discussion of imagination and illustration in *The Preparation and Delivery of Sermons,* or with Eastman's essay on The Dramatist and the Minister in *The Arts and Religion,* he will find Dr. Jones' book both interesting and helpful for the preparation of any kind of public address.

CHARLES A. MCGLON,
Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

FEMALE PERSUASION. By Margaret Farrand Thorp. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1949; pp. 254. $3.75.

In a mid-nineteenth century America, which counted among its many reforms the agitation to eliminate in current usage and literature the common practice of referring to women as 'females,' and argued for the substitution of the word 'feminine,' the subjects of Margaret Farrand Thorp's book, *Female Persuasion,* would likely have shuddered at the author's title. At the same time, they probably would have appreciated her sincere effort to present their achievements and explain their shortcomings.

To the modern reader whose interest is in rhetorical research the title of the book is misleading because the term 'persuasion' is used in its broadest connotation. The emphasis is on persuation by the example of daily living and work, by independent thought and action and by use of the pen. There is very little in *Female Persuation* about public speaking.

Mrs. Thorp has chosen six women for study, and she devotes a chapter to each. Her basis of selection is the fact that the ladies were 'strong-minded,' and helped forward the slow progress of women from the restrictions of the centuries to the freedoms of today.

Chapter 1 defines 'strong-minded women' from the twentieth century perspective as being pioneer women, women who broke patterns of convention in following their inner compulsions to help promote the welfare of mankind.

Catherine Beecher is the first pioneer woman discussed. As the eldest of the famous family of Lyman Beecher, Catherine exemplified qualities of leadership in assuming responsibilities at home, in profiting from close comradeship with her father, and in evolving from her varied experiences a philosophy which was to inspire her lifelong activities. She believed that women were intended for the threefold task of conducting the household, caring for the sick, and educating the young; and she felt that the duties of women were as important as those of the physician and law-maker—that they should be considered a profession.

As a propagandist and organizer of educational reform Catherine Beecher was an expert. In addition to using her pen freely she traveled around the country, making observations and carrying on a journalistic type of interviewing. She appeared on the public platform because it was another avenue of propaganda, but she often sat on the stage while her brother read the speeches which she had written.

Jane Grey Swisshelm, the second personality depicted, was one of the first newspaper editors among women in the United States. After a successful career as a writer, she undertook editorship of the Pittsburgh *Saturday Visiter,* and in 1857 moved to Minnesota to become editor of the St. Cloud *Visiter.* While in Minnesota Mrs. Swisshelm tangled with the State political machine, had her press thrown into the river, and gained fame as a defender of freedom of the press and of women's rights.

It was to address a meeting of the citizens of St. Cloud concerning the political battle waged through the columns of the *Visiter* that Mrs. Swisshelm appeared upon the public platform for the first time. Her newspaper was re-established by the community whose pride it was to uphold an individual's right to say his beliefs, and Mrs. Swisshelm discovered that she could command attention as a public speaker.

Another writer and editor furnishes material for Mrs. Thorp's third biography. Encouraged by a husband who was Quaker, lawyer, abolitionist and editor of the Seneca County, New York, *Courier,* Amelia Bloomer began about 1840 to write newspaper articles under a pseudonym. She progressed from writer to editor of the temeperance reform newspaper *The Lily,* from private citizen to famous reformer in a calm and gentle manner, proceeding about her work in undisturbed tranquility. When her husband appointed her deputy postmaster in Seneca Falls during the Taylor-Filmore administration, she quietly assumed the duties in order that she might demonstrate woman's

right to fill any place for which she had the capacity. Because she was editor of *The Lily*, and because her name was more apropos to the dress reform experiment than that of Elizabeth Smith Miller, the first practical proponent of the reform in Seneca Falls, Mrs. Bloomer became permanently identified with the Bloomer fashion of the 1850's.

Sara J. C. Lippincott, better known by her pen name 'Grace Greenwood' is the book's next subject. As a writer Sara published poems at nineteen. Among other achievements she became a Washington correspondent for the *Saturday Evening Post*, and the editor of one of the most popular ninteenth century juvenile magazines, *The Little Pilgrim*. As a literary lady Mrs. Lippincott was invited to give lectures and among her favorites was 'The Heroic in Common Life.' She also lectured to Civil War soldiers.

The one Southern woman discussed in *Female Persuation* is Louisa Cheves McCord, daughter of the prominent lawyer and politician Langdon Cheves, and wife of the well known South Carolina politician David J. McCord. Louisa went to school in Philadelphia while her father acted as president of the Bank of the United States, and it was there that she was introduced to anti-slavery propaganda. In 1830 she was back in South Carolina and dissatisfied at the age of twenty with woman's lot, but accepting it. She soon became busy with the duties of plantation life, supervising the care of two hundred slaves, establishing a day nursery for the slave children and overseeing a plantation hospital. However, there was still time for her to write in defense of the Southern Cause, and especially of the misunderstood institution of negro slavery. Her propaganda was directed to the misinformed Northern abolitionists. It was she who wrote the article for the *Southern Quarterly* refuting the plausibility of *Uncle Tom's Cabin*.

Louisa McCord worked and wrote for the South for many years, but did no such unladylike activity as public speaking.

Lydia Maria Child, the last of Mrs. Thorp's 'strong-minded women,' lived in Boston, the wife of lawyer and abolitionist David Child. She helped to support her family by writing poetry and fiction. In 1841 she became editor of the *National Anti-Slavery Standard*, a weekly newspaper. She also wrote a biography on *Isaac T. Hopper*, and recorded her impressions of her three year sojourn in New York City in a book of *Letters from New York*.

Mrs. Child appeared at reform conventions, but she 'never felt called upon to speak for the cause; her talent for persuasion worked most effectively in another medium.'

There is little doubt that Mrs. Thorp's six 'strong-minded women' were pioneers in the movement for the emancipation of women. But as participants in the history of American women orators not one of them merits more than mention. These women were famous as thinkers and writers, and used the public speaking platform as a subsidiary activity. And so, this book with the exciting title *Female Persuasion* must take its place as another volume in the list of general biographies of American women. It is of interest to the student of speech only as background material.

It should, however, be said that in *Female Persuasion* Margaret Farrand Thorp presents to the general reading audience a book of lively, conversational style; one which brings to flesh and blood reality a half dozen personalities, not soon to be forgotten. She stimulates a keen desire to become better acquainted with six of the nineteenth century's 'strong-minded women.'

DORIS YOAKAM TWICHELL,
Augusta, Georgia

PLAIN WORDS. A Guide to the Use of English. By Sir Ernest Gowers. London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1948. Distributed by the British Information Service, New York; pp. 94. $1.15.

Americans who have long endured gobbledegook in official quarters, who have found some solace in spoofing it in such publications as the recent pamphlet, *Federal Prose*, or who have prayed for wider reading of *The Art of Plain Talk* in high places, will be interested in this delightful treatment of the same problem. Not that it helps to know that the British citizen is also subject to what Sir Ernest labels 'officialese.' Struggling with recondite governmental language is not the kind of misery that is lessened even by good company. But it is encouraging to discover that such a volume as this devoted not just to writing 'but to write what you mean, not to affect your reader, but to affect him precisely as you wish,' was commissioned by a government agency, the British Treasury, as recognition and remedy for the problem of gobbledegook addicts.

Like Rudolf Flesch, Sir Ernest is primarily concerned with the written word, but the underlying philosophy of effective communication which he follows applies equally to the user of the spoken word: think as wise men do, speak

as the common people do, that every man may understand. Unlike *The Art of Plain Talk*, this book offers no magic formula for understandability, but it provides a clear and highly readable exposition of the art of using language so that those who read or hear may understand. The student who invests a few happy hours in studying this volume should make better speeches; and if his instructor studies it he should write better textbooks.

The author lays a foundation in chapters dealing with the elements of communicative language and principles for determining correct usage. In his concluding chapters he deals with punctuation and syntax. But the heart of the volume, and the section most useful to teachers of speech, is in the thirty-seven pages devoted to the choice of words, treated under three topics: avoiding the superfluous word, choosing the familiar word, choosing the concrete word. The principles are realistic, the examples are frequent and pertinent, and the general exposition is a delight to read. Sir Ernest writes what he preaches.

Ivor Brown has observed that 'The craftsman is proud and careful of his tools: the surgeon does not operate with an old razor-blade; the sportsman fusses happily and long over the choice of rod, gun, club or racquet. But the man who is working with words . . . is singularly neglectful of his instruments.' That man will do much better, and so will his hearers, if he makes use of *Plain Words*.

J. Jeffery Auer,
Oberlin College

THE ART OF ACTING. By John Dolman. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949; pp. xx+313. $3.50.

Out of more than forty years' experience as actor, director, and play-goer, Professor Dolman, whose *The Art of Play Production* has long held first place in its field, has written a companion volume designed to do for the actor what the first book did for the director. *The Art of Acting*, he says, is designed for 'the beginner, but not the dabbler. It presupposes no stage experience or previous instruction in acting, but it does presuppose an inquiring mind, some degree of literacy and some . . . maturity of attitude. . . .'

He begins with the origin of acting in the mimetic impulse and points out in primitive ceremonies acting motivated in religion, communication, teaching, terrorization, self-excitation, and entertainment. He notes that all these motives have left some mark on acting but that communication and entertainment are the principal motives of acting today: the best acting communicates authentic experience and entertains by invoking 'a joyous sense of imaginative and emotional release.'

Turning to the audience, Professor Dolman observes the confusion of styles today in actor-audience relationship, points out the advantages of intimacy and the advantages of aloofness, and suggests this reconcilliation: the actor 'can be externally convincing . . . avoiding the sort of intimacy that breaks down aesthetic distance; while at the same time he can share with us, through some mysterious undercurrent of sympathy, his own inner appreciation and enjoyment of the play.' He says the audience seeks from acting emotional and imaginative release, the pleasure of emphasizing with the character, objective appreciation of the actor's art, and exaltation.

This leads to a description of the dual function of the actor, who must maintain the objectivity of his creation and at the same time subtly reveal the artistry with which he creates it. Professor Dolman suggests technical means for achieving this.

In his discussion of Emotion in Acting, he stresses the James-Lange theory, and observes shrewdly that confusion would be avoided if people remembered that the actor's emotion and the character's emotion are two different things. Emotion, he concludes, is of minor importance to the actor: what really matters is imagination. He advises the stimulation of imagination through cultivation of observation and association, and he discusses the functioning of imagination in preparation and in performance.

He emphasizes the need for the actor to understand the whole play, its conflict, theme, mood, and style, and the importance of selection and emphasis in the development of the role. Here he makes an important distinction between the great variety of expression in life and the comparatively limited set of expressive symbols which have become conventional in the theatre.

General principles laid down in the first part of the book are applied in a series of chapters on practice. Rehearsing stresses team-work. Line Reading warns both against affectation and false precision, and sets as the goal clear, audible, intelligible utterance.

A chapter is devoted to the special problems of comedy, and one to those of tragedy. The latter discussion is somewhat out of the ordinary. Professor Dolman lumps all serious plays

under that heading and then divides them into 'elevating' tragedies (the old) and 'depressing' tragedies (the new). His advice on acting the old is mainly negative: avoid the tragic moan, strut, and pose. He advises that the director judiciously cut and change the emphasis of the new, 'depressing' tragedies, and that the actor cultivate his appreciation of ugliness, his sense of 'sadism,' and his nose for propaganda.

A chapter is devoted to each of the following: Reaction and By-Play, Voice, Diction (including the dialect problem), Bodily Action, and Performance.

The book concludes with fourteen pages of selected bibliography and a glossary of stage terms. The whole is embellished with over a hundred pictures of actors and actresses.

There are a few important omissions. Except for adjustment to acoustic differences, there is no discussion of special problems presented by different theatres, and there is no treatment at all of the problems of acting on the Restoration type of stage, the Elizabethan, or the modern intimate arena. There is no discussion of the actor's relation to the stage space as defined by the theatre architecture nor of his relation to the setting. This is a part of a lack of balance between the treatment of the audible and the visible elements of expression: seventy pages are devoted to reading, voice, and diction; twenty pages to bodily action.

However, the most serious defect is the author's lack of understanding of and obvious distaste for contemporary serious drama: 'Most of the moderns give us . . . a look into the sewer or the charnel house; we go home feeling degraded . . . and a little ashamed of having busied ourselves with such disgusting aspects of the human race.' He feels much the same about the other modern arts. Hence his advice on the acting of much recent drama is far from helpful.

The Art of Acting is a little old-fashioned, not only in its taste but also in its aesthetic and in its psychology, but it has the qualities of its defects, principal among them an emphasis on technique and on the value of convention and tradition in acting. Moreover, it presents a great deal of sound, practical advice in a warmly personal style enlivened by apt examples drawn from the long experience of a man who obviously loves acting and the theatre.

BARNARD HEWITT,
University of Illinois

BUILDING A CHARACTER. By Constantin Stanislavski. New York: Theatre Arts Books. 1949; pp. xx+292. $3.50.

A companion volume to *An Actor Prepares*, this might better be titled 'An Actor Perfects His Role' or 'The External Techniques of the Actor,' for only a small part is concerned specifically with characterization. Where the earlier volume taught methods for stirring the imagination and reaching the inner emotional and subconscious resources of the actor, this deals with the external side—body, voice, and tempo-rhythm. It shows how to start from an external trait, such as a costume, a gait, or a movement, and develop a character that is one part of the actor, yet very different from his everyday self.

In body-training Stanislavski assumes an enormous amount of work in acrobatics, fencing, and ballet. He has no new contribution here, even accepting the classic ballet positions and turned-out legs to an extent that few Americans would agree with. But he is concerned that the actor, in both body and voice, learn to carry through an unbroken line of well-coordinated movement.

He is much concerned with developing a full resonant voice that is the same for either singing or speaking, yet one that does not color all the sounds the same nor neglect the rich, varied roughness of consonants, as many singers do. He would have long, hard work with a diction teacher, savoring each exact and precise sound like a gourmet, developing a careful 'speech very different from the slovenly speech of every day. He has a long discussion of intonation, pauses, and accentuation. Here he adds, as a development of the subjective techniques of the first volume, the concept of a *subtext*. Behind the actual words he would have the reader visualize in precise detail the full actions, surroundings, and emotions. But when it comes to poetry, he warns against developing so heavy a subtext that it weights down and destroys the flow of the verse.

If anyone still believes the Stanislavski approach means underacting, means quiet acting, means neglect of mechanical technique, means attention only to the inner thoughts of the character, let him read the analysis of a speech of Othello. Here is the most careful attention to pauses, to the line of inflection, to conservation of energy, to the most calculated increase of pitch by rising five notes and dropping three for each measure, to pushing the climax to the highest and loudest point, to holding back the tempo deliberately in order to drive home the meaning by other effects, then at the end

dropping from the highest note to the very bottom of the register. He is just as much concerned with the external 'perspective' of the actor as with the inner perspective of the role.

The most brilliant chapters—on tempo-rhythm—are all the more welcome as they are so much better than anything written before. They are very similar to the exercises and analyses that Alexander Dean gave his directing classes. But Dean got so little on paper before he died that only those who studied with him have profited from his ideas. Others, while vaguely recognizing the importance of rhythm, have despaired of teaching anything precise about it. Dean and Stanislavski were doubtless right to start out from music. Yet acting and directing quickly get into aspects of rhythm so much more complex than anything in music that we need terminology and concepts and analyses of our own. It surely should be important to devote more research and study to the analysis of rhythm in the theatre. Towards that Dean and Stanislavski have made excellent beginnings. Curiously, Dean went further than Stanislavski by relating rhythm to the mood of the time of day and of the particular locale. While the Moscow Art Theatre productions were famous for portraying the mood of time and place, it apparently never occurred to Stanislavski to write down as a principle the relation of rhythm to environment.

Stanislavski would have been delighted to have his work combined with that of others. It is only his less creative followers who have mortified his ideas into a closed system. All his life he was seeking in the teachings and examples of others, in his own experiments as actor and as director, to find new and better ways of acting. This book makes clearer than ever that he never expected to replace other methods of study, and constantly assumes standard training in body, voice, and rehearsal. Taken not as a complete gospel but as an orientation, a corrective to the more external approaches, the two volumes are of prime importance for the modern theatre. Here, while giving full regard to technique, he is concerned with integrating it with the fully stimulated inner imagination and subconscious of the actor to reach a deeper, finer performance. Here, as in all his writing, Stanislavski shows a genuine and very inspiring dedication to his art.

GEORGE R. KERNODLE,
State University of Iowa

FROM NATIVE ROOTS. By Felix Sper. Caldwell, Idaho: The Caxton Printers, 1948; pp. 341. $4.00.

When Professor Sper undertook the job of reporting on regional drama in this country, he had a vast number of plays to look through and evaluate. It is the first time anyone has attempted the study on such a scale and it has long been needed if only to take bearings today on where we stand in regional drama. Constance Rourke and Walter Blair did a good turn for students of American literature by documenting our real and fictional folk heroes in their books on American humor. B. A. Botkin has searched widely and amassed a good deal of choice material in his *Treasury of American Folklore*. Carl Sandburg and John Lomax have anthologized songs and ballads. And now Mr. Sper has come along with an extensive review of regional materials in original plays. Unlike the others, he has not attempted an anthology but has made his approach definitely critical, for his materials are more recent and for the most part the work of living authors. The book is of noteworthy importance to academic playwrights since the bulk of Dr. Sper's materials have developed in or near the classroom, and it is in the university world where he has taken the longest and hardest look.

But to accept the author's choice of materials is also to accept and agree with his definition of regionalism. He has both Paul Green and the late Frederick Koch on his side when he determines that regional drama is rooted part and parcel in the soil, in country areas where isolation has preserved unsophisticated cultures. There are others, however, who would not agree with this narrow restriction, and avoiding the controversial term 'folk drama' like Mr. Sper, would extend regionalism to include city life as well. Sper's choice excludes a tremendous amount of native material that he does not think valid in his discussion by the very limits of his definition. If he is looking for cultural pockets, the examples of a 'Dead End' and a whole line of similar plays should stand out sharply.

Such limitations on defining regional drama and making such tight rules for it not only limit the use of regional materials for presenting modern life but also for recreating vivid moments of our past native scene. Mr. Sper would have most plays serious, so he implies, even somber and dark in the continental tradition. Apparently they must be naturalistic in the strictest uses of the term, for the natives of the regions under discussion lead a tragic

existence. What is boisterous and gay and frankly theatrical Professor Sper discounts as burlesque claptrap. There has been a long tradition in American literature, and particularly in the theatre, in the humorous approach. It would seem that comedy, burlesque, and circus treatments have as much right to serious attention as the blanket encouragement of more 'well-made' plays on somber themes. Experimenting with regional materials could produce new forms of theatre.

From Native Roots is almost sure to provoke some reaction against the sketchy treatment of ninteenth century plays with regional overtones. According to *Roots* regional playwriting as such dates scarcely from the second decade of the twentieth century, and all previous work was inconsequential and not truly regional. Again Mr. Sper undoubtedly has very reliable proponents on his side, but there are other points of view as well. The extant plays of the popular nineteenth century theatre are often poor reading indeed, but it is not fair to estimate theatre materials entirely on written evidence as literary historians so often are inclined to do. The actors who performed these pieces were expert at their trade and often regionalists in a very true sense. George Hill, James H. Hackett, Joseph Jefferson, John E. Owens, James A. Herne, and Edward Harrigan, to name but a few, are good evidence to a much different estimate of regionalism in nineteenth century theatre. As early as the 1830's American actors were bringing native materials to the stage, but the plays left as evidence were more acting scenarios than finished dramas, and some of the most famous pieces were never printed. The actor who was usually directly responsible for their inception brought the characters to life, and what was real and true, although often exaggerated in the spirit of low comedy, was highly valued by them. These plays cannot be so easily dismissed when this is kept in mind.

But once his rules for regional drama are accepted, Mr. Sper's game is a good one, for the *Inside USA* spirit of the book makes it entertaining reading. The brief summaries of the many plays discussed, moreover, present a sociological picture of the United States that cannot be overlooked. An extensive bibliography of regional materials, including a selective list of regional plays in print, furnishes one of the book's most valuable sections. Perhaps what *Roots* shows most clearly is the rapid progress in regional drama during the nineteen twenties and thirties. But what has happened in our present decade is not so apparent; it may still be too close to make any proper estimate.

Dr. Sper's encouragement of regional playwriting is invigorating. 'To call the regional drama "tributary" to Broadway is a gross impertinence,' he writes with feeling; and he goes on to argue in favor of a people's theatre long overdue. What the many playwrights must learn, he says, is the discipline of play composition. With improved plays a huge ready-made audience cannot long remain blind to the theatre experience inherent in a good regional drama.

FRANCIS HODGE,
University of Texas

TWENTY-FIVE BEST PLAYS OF THE MODERN AMERICAN THEATRE. Edited with an Introduction by John Gassner. New York: Crown Publishers, 1949; pp. xxvii+756. $5.00.

The editing of any anthology of literature, and especially of modern drama, is a complicated and exasperating task, requiring sound scholarship, high critical ability, dogged determination, unrelenting perseverance, and serenity in the face of constant disappointements. John Gassner's third volume of modern American plays bears further evidence of his possession of these qualities. In a Prefatory Note he writes:

> The present volume represents a belated effort to fill a need left by the two previous collections of American plays published by Crown: *Twenty Best Plays of the Modern American Theatre*, which covered the period of the nineteen thirties, and *Best Plays of the Modern American Theatre: Second Series*, which presented the drama of the war crisis. With the present *Twenty-five Best Plays of the Modern American Theatre: Early Series*, the publishers now provide the general reader, the playgoer, and the student a living record of the period between 1919 and 1929, when our theatre arrived at maturity, and of the stirrings in the direction of modernity a few years earlier, as expressed by the Little Theatre movement through the production of ground-breaking one-act plays. The three volumes, taken together, now comprise a continuous account and anthology of the modern drama in America.

In the present volume Gassner has attempted to present, not only every important playwright who came to prominence before 1930, but also the forms, types, and schools of drama appearing in our theatre during that period. O'Neill is represented by 'The Hairy Ape,' 'Desire Under the Elms,' and the one-act play, 'Ile'

Maxwell Anderson by 'What Price Glory?,' 'God's of the Lightning,' and 'Saturday's Children'; Philip Barry by 'Paris Bound'; Elmer Rice by 'Street Scene'; S. N. Behrman by 'The Second Man'; Sidney Howard by 'They Knew What They Wanted'; George S. Kaufman by 'Beggar on Horseback'; Paul Green by his early one-act play, 'White Dresses'; George Kelly by 'Craig's Wife' and 'Poor Aubrey'; and Robert E. Sherwood by his best success to that time, 'The Road to Rome.' In addition to these playwrights who continued their playwriting with success after the end of the period covered, Marc Connelly, Philip Dunning, George Abbott, Dorothy and DuBose Heyward, Ben Hecht, Charles MacArthur, E. P. Conkle, Edna St. Vincent Millay, Sophie Treadwell, Harold Hickerson, Preston Sturges, John L. Bladerston, Lewis Beach, and Susan Glaspell are included either as colloborators or with individual plays.

The book also contains seven one-act plays, representative of the general development of the one-act play prior to 1930. Realism of varying shades, expressionism and symbolism, fantasy, the social-problem play, high comedy, low comedy, naturalism, and melodrama are included; but the closest approach to tragedy is to be found in O'Neill's 'Desire Under the Elms' and 'The Hairy Ape.' The degree to which these plays fail to measure up to the standards of significant tragedy is the degree by which our theatre and our age have failed to produce great tragedy. Among them are many examples of competent craftsmanship and some instances of expertness; but as one reads through them again, he is impressed with their impermanence. They are for the most part theatre pieces made for special Broadway production at a special time. As such they are, many of them, well done, but they hardly rise above or go beyond that attainment.

One of the most valuable features of the book is Gassner's excellent introduction. His summary of the period is astute and sound. The volume also contains A Memorandum on Other Productions in New York City, A Supplementary List of Plays, and a bibliography. Students of the American drama will find John Gassner's three-volume anthology indispensable.

HUBERT HEFFNER,
Stanford University

A MANUAL OF PRONUNCIATION. By Morriss H. Needleman. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1949; pp. cxxiii+323. $4.00.

The 'Manual of Pronunciation,' listing 'about 5800 words selected as commonly mispronounced' which 'are everyday (or spoken) rather than "literary" (or written) or "elegant" or "hard" words,' is preceded by directions, keys, special notes, and a xcviii-page 'Guide to Pronunciation.' The unique feature is that 'Three systems of notation are used—the SIMPLIFIED, the DIACRITICAL, and the PHONETIC.'

Considerably more than half of the Guide to Pronunciation is 'The Sounds of Spoken English,' a paraphrasing of Kenyon's The Sounds of Spoken English in his Guide to Pronunciation, *Webster's New International Dictionary, Second Edition;* the author is 'deeply appreciative of the permission to make free use of the famous Merriam-Webster diacritical symbols and especially of "A Guide. . . ."' The adoption is amost absolute as to general arrangement, not the best feature of Kenyon's Guide, and coverage, with some improvement in section numbering except for the curious grouping of 'F,G' in one section and compensating extra section for some of the minor variants of G.

There are a few accidents in the scissors-and-paste operation, e.g.: one complete line of long-oo examples drops out; *cow* gets into the ou section heading although it appears as example in the next, ow, section; *connect* is separated from *conform* and turns up in the heading for the section on schwa in final unstressed syllables.

Where Kenyon's material is rewritten, condensed or expanded, I have been unable to find a single instance of clarification, hardly one unconfused by the alteration. There are misprints or misstatements such as: '(This manual, however, is not using the vowel symbol [ɔɪ] to express a monosyllabic vowel forming a diphthong with the preceding vowel.)'—which has nothing to do with the main business of the paragraph; 'Castilian Spaniards pronounce c before e and i like the th in *then*,' and in the same paragraph one example misspelled and the other mispronounced. The larger obfuscations, as in the treatment of the 'a as in ask' with nothing of Kenyon's systematic coverage and in the jumble on 'Sounding the r,' are worse. To take one example in small compass, Kenyon has:

> §260. In Spanish, *x* is most frequently like *ks*, sometimes *gs;* before a consonant, it is often colloquially *s;* occasionally it is an older spelling for K, now usually spelled *j*, which is respelled with *h*. *Quixote*.

Needleman has:

> §43. 2. *Spanish x*.

1) In Spanish, x is in familiar speech like English s—especially when x precedes another consonant.

2) Usually, Spanish x is sounded as ks; occasionally, like gs.

3) x in Spanish may sometimes represent k, which is respelled with h.

Kenyon is probably in part wrong, certainly not in agreement with Navarro-Tomás and not quite in agreement with his own §274, but Needleman demonstrates that he understands neither Kenyon nor the pronunciation in question. No use seems to be made of detail No. 3 in the word list; the commonest cruxes, *Quixote* and *Mexico*, do not appear.

The additions to Kenyon's material on Sounds of Spoken English are principally descriptions of sounds and advice to the elegant pronouncer. Typical of the former is:

> In the formation of r, . . . the soft palate [not mentioned in other descriptions] is raised, the lips are slightly protruded, and the sides of the tongue are against the upper side teeth. Sometimes it is the tip of the tongue that is lifted to the gum ridge; sometimes the middle that is raised toward the hard palate. No matter which part of the tongue is used for producing any given sound with r, the breath stream is gradually sent out over the raised part. Like the glide consonants [l] and [j], the glide consonant [r] depends chiefly upon the movement of the tongue.

The advice is what one would expect it to be.

The earlier and later parts of the introduction are as badly confused. The triplicate system of notation spreads the key over eight pages, the columns by no means equivalent, and requires three antiquated vowel charts, to which a fourth is added with a bow to the Tillyites. Section 8 has final unstressed -y always lowered, whereas §50.20 has it often raised; the adaptation from Kenyon, §28.4.5, includes both lowering and raising without Kenyon's specification of the former as typically British. One section curiously groups 'Dissimilation; Long U; Plural of Nouns,' the last more confused in over a page here than it had been in a short half page under s. The sections on prefixes, suffixes, and normal interpretation of English spellings would be valuable but that the first two are not altogether reliable and the third badly confuses spellings and pronunciations.

The manual itself, i.e., the word list, probably justifies the footnote:

> It is not claimed that this handbook lists every acceptable pronunciation; it is claimed that this handbook lists *more* acceptable pronunciations than any other dictionary.

The pronunciations may all be acceptable, although it is doubtful that some are ever used. It would be difficult to check the count. Is it for *nature* the one of the diacritical column, the two of the simplified column, or the four of the phonetic column? *Nature* also appears as a key word, and there has four pronunciations in the simplified column. Is it for *dispersion* the two of the simplified and diacritical or the eight of the phonetic column?

These examples, and others, e.g., *mature*, show real contradictions among the three columns. But the variety in strict count is not always significant because the columns are not equivalent. The diacritical column is cluttered with footnote references to the Guide, many of them pointing to unsymbolized variants which may or may not be the same as those shown in the simplified column. (Only one footnote appears, frequently but not consistently, in the Simplified column, that a reference to a statement in the section on suffixes that the symbol for long i means what it is supposed to mean.) Only the first two columns are guaranteed: 'Every pronunciation in the SIMPLIFIED and the DIACRITICAL columns is backed by authority,' restated three times in the preface. But 'On the assumption that a student of phonetics will understand the reason for other variants that are not without warrant, additional pronunciations are given in the PHONETIC column,' including Eastern and Southern variants. One might quibble as to the use of the heading of the third column, for all keys are more or less phonetic, and might suggest such column heads as: inadequate, old-fashioned, best available.

It is doubtful that there could be any advantage in triplicate keys if the columns were exactly equivalent. The one-key inquirer can find a more authoritative dictionary with much more coverage in his key and the master of all keys has access to Kenyon-Knott. Triplicate keys which supplement each other only introduce unnecessary complications.

Finally as to the vocabulary of the word list, the basis of selection is admirable. Assuming that the procedure of selection was as good as the intent, it is still doubtful that it is worth anyone's shelf space to add so limited

a work to more inclusive books readily available.

LEE S. HULTZEN,
University of Illinois

PORTUGUESE-AMERICAN SPEECH. An outline of Speech Conditions Among Portuguese Immigrants in New England and Elsewhere in the United States. By Leo Pap. New York: King's Crown Press, 1949; pp. xi+223. $3.00.

The title of this book misrepresents its contents in two respects. It is not a treatise on Portuguese-American speech because phonetic, morphological, and syntactic transformations (such as may have occurred) are treated only in a casual, sketchy, and haphazard manner. Secondly, it is concerned almost exclusively with the Portuguese speech of New England, that of the other region of large Portuguese population, California, entering in only incidentally and based on very inadequate data. As a whole, the work lacks unity of purpose and of organization, and is almost devoid of any comprehensive synthesis. There are dabs of scattered information on historical material, economic and social conditions, observations on speech conditions, phonology, morphology, semantics, folk-lore, regionalisms, and a chapter on proper names which, as the author points out, 'may be considered as a sort of appendix.'

The real meat and true worth of the book is to be found in Chapter 4, The Influence of English in Immigrant Portuguese, pp. 83-123, and in this part the true value resides in the study of English words and expressions which have intruded into the native speech. Here we have data and observations which, from the linguistic point of view, are genuinely interesting and valuable.

A few detailed criticisms may now be in order. Chapter 3, Survival of Regional and Popular Speech Traits, is particularly weak. For the regional part, the author points out three or four characteristics of Azorean or Madeiran speech surviving among the New England Portuguese of Azorean and Maderian extraction. Naturally there are such survivals, since the immigrant on landing in this country continued to speak the only language he knew. The few characteristics the author notes are scanty compared with the many that exist. As for the survival of Popular Speech Traits, they are the only ones that could survive, since the mass of the Portuguese-speaking immigrants were either illiterate or at best very poorly educated, and spoke a highly 'popular' Portuguese. For example, on page 63 Pap says: 'None of the six informants used the standard terms *catarata* or *catadupa* spontaneously to designate a waterfall; instead they employed the use of the more popular words *queda d' água*, etc. And why shouldn't they use the more popular word, the one they always used in the land of their origin? Surely the author does not think that the illiterate immigrant on leaving the homeland would immedately adopt the learned and literary language which, incidentally, he never knew. How many Americans speaking their popular language would spontaneously say 'cataract' instead of 'waterfall'? The English usage here is exactly parallel to the Portuguese. Likewise (p. 71) *menina do ôlho* is popular but perfectly standard Portuguese for the pupil of the eye. The form *pupila* is literary, as the author himself observes.

Many of the deviations from standard Portuguese which the author notes are not peculiar to the Portuguese immigrants to the United States, but are simply specimens of the Portuguese spoken wherever there are groups of poorly educated Portuguese.

On p. 80 Pap mentions the word *pataca* as being used occasionally in New England for 'dollar,' the *pataca* being, he says, the old Portuguese and Brazilian money unit. This word, like the *xerafim*, is of Eastern origin and is still the monetary unit in Macau and Timor, roughly equivalent to the Hongkong dollar. One wonders if it is not possible that the word came into New England through immigrants from those Eastern colonies, perhaps by way of the Hawaiian Islands? On p. 87 the widespread use in New England of *doutor* in the sense of physician is attributed to the influence of English usage. But this is hardly probable as the word *doutor* is widely used in the same sense in Portugal. The English and Portuguese use of this word is in the two senses of a physician or a person holding an advanced degree in some field of study is almost exactly similar.

To conclude, the reviewer finds it regrettable that the excellence of Chapter 4 is marred by its inclusion with chapters which are either rather sketchily developed, haphazardly presented, or only slightly germane. The definitive work on the Portuguese language in the United States remains to be written.

L. G. MOFFATT,
University of Virginia

A MINIATURE TEXTBOOK OF FEEBLEMINDEDNESS. By Leo Kanner, M.D. Child Care Monographs, No. 1. New York: Child Care Publications, 1949; pp. 33. $1.25.

Dr. Kanner opens this monograph by pointing out that the study of 'feeblemindedness' at the present time seems to be at the level of the study of 'insanity' as it existed three quarters of a century ago. With this pessimistic note, he optimistically proceeds to indicate that we are now questioning our concepts and practices and can look forward to progress in the handling of the feebleminded.

The concept of individual differences as applied to the insane is now being recognized in the feebleminded. This departure from the assumption of homogeneity is traced by Dr. Kanner to four developments of the past few decades. First, as a result of numerous studies, certain distinctive clinical syndromes have been noted, and it has become obvious that there is a variety of conditions which heretofore have been lumped together under the term feebleminded. Second, with the advent of psychometry, the relative nature of the I.Q. has been demonstrated. It is no longer feasible to divide the population into two parts, one feebleminded and the other not feebleminded. Third, the force of dynamic psychiatry which views patients as individual personalities is being reflected in the treatment of the feebleminded. Instead of mere diagnosis and classification, witness the growth of special education and vocational training. The fourth development which helped to remove the concept of homogeneity is related to the hereditary factor. The percentage of hereditary origin of feeblemindedness, as reported by reliable investigators, varies from 90% in 1920 to 29% in 1934. It is recognized that the change is not due to a sudden drop in the inheritance of feeblemindedness, but to more precise methods of study. Based upon these figures, and his twenty years of psychiatric experience, Dr. Kanner is opposed to sterilization on the 'sole grounds of psychometric minus.'

Having pointed out numerous changes in attitudes, information, new questions and insights, Dr. Kanner suggests a pragmatic grouping of the feebleminded:

1. Absolute feeblemindedness—the individual is 'truly, absolutely, irreversibly feebleminded or mentally deficient in every sense of the word.'
2. Relative feeblemindedness—the individual limitation is definitely related to the standards of the particular society. In another society these individuals might be perfectly adequate or even successful.
3. Apparent feeblemindedness—the individual appears to be limited at the time of the psychometric rating, but under different circumstances would attain a higher I.Q. These include the individuals with special disabilities.

Following a brief discussion of each of these groups, the author suggests a 'personal profile' technique as a means of studying an individual in any one of the categories. The profile is structured along the following categories:

1. Genetic determinants
2. Cultural determinants
3. Material determinants
4. Physical determinants
5. Educational determinants
6. Emotional determinants.

A detailed discussion of each determinant is included with three sample profiles as illustrations of their use.

This little monograph gives a brief history of the study of feeblemindedness and presents the author's suggested classification and method of study of the 'intellectually inadequate.' Its greatest contribution, however, lies in the clearly stated need for modernization of concepts and practices in the light of pertinent developments in all allied fields. With this modernization will come a more adequate program for human engineering, which is the author's goal. The contents of this pamphlet will be of value to all persons who share Dr. Kanner's interest in improving our methods of human engineering.

RUTH K. STEER,
M. D. STEER,
Purdue University

FUNDAMENTALS OF WRITING FOR RADIO. Drama, Talks, Continuities, and Nondramatic Features with Guidance in Program Planning, Production, and Marketing. By Rome Cowgill. New York: Rinehart and Company, 1949; pp. vi+295. $3.50.

At last someone has written a book on radio writing which reflects the point of view of the teacher and educational radio enthusiast rather than that of the commercial radio writer or director. Prior to taking a position as script writer for the Voice of America, Miss Cowgill was for a number of years an instructor in radio and script editor for WHA, the educational radio station at the University of Wisconsin. The author's experience as a teacher and educator is reflected throughout the

book, but it is especially noticeable in the practical exercises for the student which are given at the ends of eight of the chapters. Except for her attitude and method of approach, the author offers little that has not already been said, and in many cases said more clearly, by the writers who represent the commercial side of radio.

In behalf of the book it can be said that the material on radio dramatic writing is excellent. The explanations of how the writer can handle the mechanics of sound, music, and transitions are well set forth. Miss Cowgill's short script, examples of what is good and what is bad, illustrate clearly the points she is attempting to make. Seven full-length scripts, three of them by the author, included in the body of the text to illustrate various types of radio writing, are interesting and should be most helpful to the student.

The title and sub-title of the book are, however, misleading. It might more aptly have been titled 'Fundamentals of Writing Radio Drama,' for eight of the thirteen chapters, and these are the best ones, are devoted to dramatic writing. The rest of radio writing is dismissed somewhat casually in three short chapters: Continuity and Spot Announcements, Music Continuity, and Talks. The author explains in her Preface this apparent lack of balance:

> I have found it simplest to turn next [after a discussion of radio and the writer] to radio's most complex form—the drama. In the first place, students are usually more interested in drama than in other forms of writing. More important than this natural motivation, drama uses all the elements of radio—words, music, and sounds—making the nature of the medium more apparent than it is in programs which depend upon words alone. For the beginner, writing radio drama is an exercise in learning the medium, and a student who can turn out a technically acceptable broadcast play knows the tools of his trade.

Knowing the tools of radio dramatic writing is not going to insure that the student will have an insight into the methods of writing other types of radio copy. Such knowledge will not, for example, enable him to write radio talks so that the listener will not only have his attention arrested, but will be interested in the subject, be aware of the pattern of development, and remember the main ideas expressed. Any book that purports, as this one does in both its title and sub-title, to give the fundamentals of writing radio talks should certainly include a discussion of basic human motives or drives, specific methods of arousing attention and maintaining interest, and some discussion of organization and outlining.

Failing to find a discussion of motives or drives in the chapter on talks, one might expect to find it in the chapter on Continuity and Spot Announcements, but such is not the case. The chapter on Music Continuity is also somewhat sketchy in its coverage of fundamental points for the novice writer. For example, it omits completely any list of reference volumes and sources on music and musicians. Comprehensive bibliographies are given at the ends of some of the chapters on dramatic writing, but none are given for the three chapters which cover the rest of the radio writing field.

The typographical layout of the book could be improved in order to make the student more aware of the author's organization, main points, and the relative importance of materials. A person thoroughly familiar with radio writing can readily enough pick out the important points from the text, but the novice would be greatly aided had the author made use of an outline form and type so varied in size as to aid the student visually.

Miss Cowgill writes with sincerity and enthusiasm, but without gushing. Because of its style, vocabulary, and general level, the book will probably find its widest acceptance as a textbook in high schools rather than in colleges or universities.

A comprehensive book on the subject of radio writing has yet to be written. When, and if, it is written it will probably be the work of several writers. Someone in the field of public speaking should write the chapters on the radio talk, discussion, forum, and interviewing; a radio news editor, the chapters on feature writing, and gathering, writing, and editing newscast copy; a radio publicity man, the chapters on publicity and promotion (via newspapers, magazines, posters, billboards, etc., as well as by air); a person in commercial radio should prepare material on writing commercials; and, of course, the radio dramatist would prepare the chapters on radio writing.

GEORGE P. WILSON, JR.,
University of Virginia

SPEECH METHODS IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL. By Carrie Rasmussen. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1949; pp. ix+340. $3.50.

Miss Rasmussen sets herself the difficult task of writing a textbook on speech for elementary

classroom teachers. Her readers, as she knows, will usually have had only one course in public speaking or beginning interpretation. They must, therefore, be given basic information on voice, articulation, and physical activity for speech, on reasons why speech skills are vital to the child's development, and on the techniques by which speech is taught directly at this level. Such an abundance of subject-matter would, of course, crowd any book.

The stated aim of *Speech Methods* is to offer practical suggestions to teachers on handling the numerous speech problems that arise in the classroom. It is the author's belief that children can be taught to talk better only through a systematic course in speech; that while speech education can be integrated in the total learning activities, the best results are achieved by the direct approach. Teachers should, therefore, be trained in the essential techniques. The speech improvement program should consist both of the development of skill through activities and a regular speech training period.—a specific time set aside for work under a competent teacher.

Miss Rasmussen's principal contribution lies in her description of classroom techniques for teaching rhythm, pantomime, creative dramatics, puppetry, and the reading of poetry. She gives extensive lists of stories to dramatize, poems to read aloud, and plays to produce. These certainly will prove helpful to the teacher in search of ideas.

The fact, however, that the book has a dual aim—to explain the basic elements of speech and their importance, and to present specific teaching techniques—tends to weaken the structure of the whole. A quick attempt to define speech and the child's vital need of speech skills, a two-page treatment of 'thought,' and another brief glance at 'listening' may make the reader feel that the entire book is light in its approach. The classroom teacher needs techniques, but she will not seek to understand the ultimate goals in teaching speech if her text does not stimulate her thinking. The sections concerned with the philosophy of teaching are probably aimed at the teacher who has had little or no specific speech training. They could, therefore, have profited by being made more concrete and specific.

Miss Rasmussen's own extensive experience with techniques for teaching speech at this level vouches for the practicality of her suggestions for the special speech period. Classroom teachers are constantly in need of such suggestions.

ELISE HAHN,
University of California at Los Angeles

HOW TO SPEAK THE WRITTEN WORD. A Guide to Effective Public Reading. By Nedra Newkirk Lamar. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1949; pp. 175. $2.50.

Nedra Newkirk Lamar begins her book with this statement: 'The whole purpose of this book is to help you read naturally. Many trained readers have all the naturalness trained out of them.' The author evidently distrusts much present-day teaching, and has decided to get down to 'brass tacks.' She presents a practical handbook, designed primarily for radio announcers and commentators, and for those who read the Bible for an audience. Though no new ideas are offered, the reader is given a sound treatment of the uses of stress and phrasing in making logical meaning clear. Two chapters are devoted to emphasis, two to phrasing, and one to reading the Bible.

Any number of helpful rules are explained and illustrated. For example: 'Emphasize the new idea or the contrast and subdue the old idea. Any word you can leave out without changing the meaning you need not and should not emphasize. When reading a sentence containing a connecting word, especially a relative followed by a parenthetical expression set off by commas, subdue the connecting word and do not pause after it.' Three series of exercises, consisting primarily of sentences from the Bible, are given for practice in placing emphasis and pausing in the right places.

There is a noticeable confusion in the author's use of the words, *meaning* and *interpretation*. Many times the reader is told that he must read intelligently and meaningfully. Conversely, however, he is also told: 'At no place in this book will the reader be told what a scriptural passage "means." Therefore, the students of these instructions will not be enticed into that rightfully dreaded thing called "interpretation."' Yet later an attempt is made to distinguish between *personal* and *legitimate* interpretation. It is also admitted that everyone uses *interpretation*, whether he realizes it or not. Recently *interpretation* has been used by the majority of teachers and writers to mean bringing the full-blooded product to life for the audience without centering the attention of the audience upon technique. It is hoped that the author is not as frightened of the word as she appears to be.

In the chapter, How to Read the Bible, many

useful suggestions are given, especially concerning forms which are archaic and therefore difficult to understand and read properly. In addition, numerous minor matter are discussed, ranging from the clothes one should wear to whether or not one should brush a fly from his nose. Some of these are unduly obvious and the organization of the material is quite haphazard, but the meat of the chapter is good and would undoubtedly, if digested, vitalize the Bible for an audience.

Some space is devoted to pronunciation, particularly in connection with words often mispronounced in Bible reading. The author also suggests that short *i* be substituted for short *e* to give conversational quality. There is a widespread tendency in Southern speech to make such a substitution, so that it is often difficult to distinguish *pens* from *pins*. The example given in the book is, 'We appreciated your kindness in sending Alices' roses.' This, translated into conversational speech reads, 'We appreciatid your kindniss in sending Aliciz roziz.' Surely this is not the most acceptable explanation of changing pedantic pronunciation to easy, natural speech.

The book is written in an informal, chatty style. The reader has the illusion that Miss Lamar is talking to him. He is convinced that she is an enthusiastic teacher and that she has said a number of useful things, and has said them a sufficient number of times so that he will not forget them.

MARGARET ROBB,
University of Colorado

VOICE AND DICTION. By Victor A. Fields and James F. Bender. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1949; pp. viii+368. $4.00.

This latest book in the field of voice training is primarily a drill and practice book for use in improving the normal speaking voice, although the authors suggest in the Preface that it would also be useful in dealing with such specific speech problems as 'speech-fright,' foreign accent, and stuttering. They state, 'emphasis is on drill material, tested on many thousands of cases of individuals with functional difficulties of speech and voice. Only a modicum of theory is given, enough—we believe—to make the exercises understandable.' It should be noted that the term *diction*, which forms part of the title, is employed with a somewhat broader concept of its meaning than many speech teachers have grown accustomed to accepting when it is associated with the term *voice*. Thus, some effort has been later in the book to give attention to such aspects of 'diction' as vocabulary, discrimination in the use of words, and preciseness and effectiveness of general oral expression.

The material of the book is presented in eight chapters entitled respectively, Speech and Voice Improvement, Breathing, Voice, The Consonants, The Vowels, Ear Training, Pronunciation, and Oral Reading. The authors rightly stress the preminence of ear training as a necessary accompaniment to any work on voice or diction, and they recommend an initial recording for purposes of vocal analysis. To assist in this process, twelve vocal 'difficulties' are identified for the student to keep in mind as he listens to his recording. Further discipline in ear training is provided in Chapter 6, where thirty-six pages are devoted to a number of helpful and ingenious exercises, plus a rather formal presentation of the phonetic alphabet with some twenty-four pages of exercises and materials designed to acquaint the student in its use. It should be noted in passing that this is virtually the only use made of phonetic symbols throughout the book; with the exception of a few brief references to each speech sound in the chapters on the consonants and vowels, where phonetic symbols are employed, conventional spelling, or respelling, is used throughout the text whenever reference is made to speech sounds or to problems of pronunciation.

Of the total text only the first sixty-five pages are devoted to the subject of voice proper, although the chapter on Oral Reading gives some attention to such vocal attributes as quality, inflection, and stress. The major portion of the book is taken up with a presentation of the individual speech sounds, under each of which are included lists of words and selected passages from literature illustrating the use of the sound. A relatively long chapter also deals with the more common problems of pronunciation and vocabulary.

Extra pages are alloted to certain sounds which often present special difficulties, such as *l*, *r*, *s*, and *ng*. Here again, however, the space is devoted largely to drills and exercises; there is very little explanation of the nature of the difficulties often encountered in the production of these sounds. For example, although lateral lisping is referred to, no adequate explanation is given of what it is or what may cause it. Again, no distinction is made under the discussion of *r*, between the pre-vocalic and post-vocalic forms in American speech. Faulty *l* production is referred to as 'lalling,' but no explanation of this condition is offered.

As a general text for the average class in voice

and diction taught by the average teacher of this subject, the chief short-coming of the book, in the opinion of this reviewer, is its paucity of scientific explanation, and pedagogical theory and rationale, upon which a sound, effective program of voice training should be based. With the exception of brief and sketchy references here and there, no general philosophy or unified program of theory is set forth. Too often exercises are presented with insufficient explanation of their ultimate purpose or their relation to those which precede or follow. The student is told what to do—and this is quite clearly done—but too often he is not told why he is to do it or what its relation may be to the total program which he is pursuing. The student also probably needs at least some explanation of the mechanism with which he is dealing, especially if he is expected to accomplish anything on his own or with a minimum of guidance from an instructor.

Moreover, if one were to restrict himself to a purely scientific point of view, he might legitimately raise questions concerning some of the theory that is presented. Explanations of such functions as breathing, tone production at the glottis, and hearing are excessively brief and too often subject to the misinterpretation likely to accompany a vague and abridged explanation of something that is essentially complex. Such statements as 'the front and lateral muscles of the chest wall may be expanded and contracted voluntarily' and 'in vocalization it [the diaphragm] is essentially a pressure regulator, responding to the impulse to speak loudly or to project tone forcefully,' not only illustrate this danger, but also suffer from an unfortunate choice of terminology.

The strength of this book lies largely in the wealth and variety of the drill and exercise material which it contains. Seldom has this reviewer seen a textbook in this field with as many different exercises, including the oft-neglected subject of ear training, or as much drill material to implement the exercises. Moreover, the exercises seem theoretically sound, and they give every evidence of being effective. There is also sufficient variety to prevent the student from becoming bored. The general basic approach to a program of voice improvement is sound, so far as it goes. For example, the authors recognize that the essential step in such a program is to free the vocal mechanism so that it may perform at its best. Accordingly, considerable stress is given to exercises that are conducive to relaxation of the essential structures involved in voice production.

No bibliography is included, and there are very few footnote references.

VIRGIL A. ANDERSON,
Stanford University

PRACTICAL DEBATING. By Luther W. Courtney and Glenn R. Capp. New York: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1949; pp. viii+308. $3.25.

As the title suggests, this is a text on debate principles. Written by two men who give evidence of being quite at home in the field of intercollegiate debate, it approaches the subject in terms of the more conventional objectives and practices. While it is not as complete as some might wish, it is clearly and interestingly written, and presents much useful material in a manner which the beginning collegiate and advanced high school student can understand.

The opening chapter outlines the role discussion may play in the preparatory stages. Equally helpful in orienting the beginning student is the second chapter which enumerates and explains certain fundamental principles. Unfortunately no effort is made to present a philosophy of debate, nor is the importance of this activity in our democratic society discussed. The assumption seems to be that debating contests are their own justification. In the opinion of this reviewer the book could be improved by including a consideration of the part discussion and debate play in public life.

The authors are to be commended for omitting a treatment of strategy. Their statement that, 'The most effective strategy is careful preparation,' deserves wider circulation and acceptance. In handling the problem of ethics they have been equally wise, for instead of isolating this important matter in a separate chapter, specific and functional applications have been made in developing the various principles of debate.

Though relatively short, the book is well illustrated by means of specific examples drawn from many subjects and sources. Excellent use has been made of quotations from student debates, and, fortunately, the revision and polishing of these have been held to a minimum. The beginning debater should find in the style and freshness of these excerpts a standard of student speaking which he may approximate. While many students and teachers alike regard briefing with distaste and suspicion, the treatment which the authors give this subject is clear, concise, and adequately motivated. The illustrations and exercises are well chosen to reinforce the principles. For the beginning student of debate it

is one of the best chapters on this topic that has come to my attention.

In reading the very well written chapter on Evidence, it was somewhat of a surprise to discover *analogy* classed as evidence of fact (a classification which Crocker also uses) rather than as a mode of inference. The discussion of deductive reasoning is reasonably clear, but the chapter would be greatly improved (as would such chapters in most textbooks on argumentation and debate) by a simplification of terminology and more functional illustrations and examples. The section on Delivery is limited to certain specific problems related to debate. Experienced directors will recognize here an effort to correct some of the peculiarities of behavior and delivery that often characterize student debaters whose audiences have run heavily to tournament judges. It serves as an excellent argument for teaching students more about the fundamental purpose and potentialities of debate and providing them with more audience experiences. Rather than giving a separate chapter to fallacies, common errors of reasoning are discussed in connection with argument and rebuttal. For courses in debate such an approach seems to be a practical one. The authors make no effort, however, to explain why they fail to discuss topics such as forms of debate, construction of the case, or development of the debate speech.

While there are many excellent features to recommend this book, certain omissions, and unusual statements should be noted. On page 71 classification of *The United States News* alongside the *Congressional Record* and *The Statesman's Yearbook* may be open to question. An omission may be mentioned in connection with the listing of debate handbooks on page 73. The quality of the *Annual Debate Handbook* edited by Professor Bower Aly for the NUEA Committee, and the form and scope of the handbooks on various debate topics prepared by Professor Hugo Hellman should place these publications high on any list. A final comment concerns one of several rather dogmatic statements appearing at different points in the book. In discussing the problem of permanent peace as a potential debate proposition the following appears on page 37, 'It would serve as a challenging subject to graduate students; it would be above the ability of college freshmen.' If the foregoing be true, it would seem that on several occasions the NUEA Committee's choice of high school questions has been most inappropriate and the collegiate committees have done little better.

In summary, it may be said that this book should prove a valuable aid to the many directors and participants in forensic programs throughout the country. The vigor, conciseness, and excellent illustrations more than compensate for the inadequacies noted.

THORREL B. FEST,
University of Colorado

YOU AND YOUR SPEECHES. By E. C. Buehler. Lawrence, Kansas: The Allen Press, 1949; pp. 226. $3.00.

It would be very difficult—and probably not very profitable—to review the book, *You and Your Speeches*, written by E. C. Buehler, without making some small attempt to 'review' Professor Buehler himself. The book has been developed over a period of more than ten years, and is so evidently a reflection of the author's teaching experience that it could hardly be discussed apart from its obvious source.

To most readers of the QUARTERLY JOURNAL, it will be no news that Professor Buehler has, for some twenty-five years, taught public speaking and coached debate at the University of Kansas. Several thousand students have passed through his classes. Most of them, to judge by the sample I am acquainted with, would testify that the experience was genuinely educational, and that the skills they acquired were both usable and useful. In all this lengthy experience, unless I completely misunderstand his teaching, Mr. Buehler has maintained a simple but apparently most workable philosophy: that the focus of a speech class should really be on the techniques of effective speaking, as discovered through constant experiment and experience with audiences. He has never made extensive use of, say, psychology as a basis for rhetorical theory, any more than he has attempted to teach political science or economics by means of speaking assignments.

In a period when many teachers of speech are prone to use scholarly research as an avenue to rhetorical theory, and when many teachers are concerned with the content of speech at the expense of techniques, this approach is distinctive though not unique. It has, in Mr. Buehler's case at least, one great merit: in the practical classroom situation it results in good teaching and good learning.

This approach—and, I believe, the accompanying merit—are contained in *You and Your Speeches*. Many textbooks—as Buehler points out in his Preface—are written to impress one's colleagues; others are written to educate the author; and only some to aid in the student's

learning process. *You and Your Speeches*, the author claims, falls into the last category. There is considerable justice in the claim. The book consists chiefly of detailed, practical instructions on how to speak well, phrased in simple and often colloquial language, and obviously arranged to catch the student's interest and to facilitate his learning. There is very little theory, as such, in the book, and almost no evidence adduced to support the 'principles' stated—except, of course, the impressive authority of the author's experience. If one were to think of *You and Your Speeches* as a painting, it might be observed that the foreground is occupied by practical instructions for the acquisition of a skill, while the 'principles' from which these instructions are drawn appear well in the middle distance; and that the evidence which supports the principles (of interest to critics and teachers of speech rather than to beginning students) is no more than a kind of overhanging haze on the horizon. I do not mean by this figure to suggest that the evidence is non-existent (Buehler acknowledges his debt to his own teachers of speech, and estimates that he has heard and criticized 140,000 speeches in his professional career—which is surely a fair basis for generalization). I do mean to suggest that this sort of material is not stressed in this book.

You and Your Speeches is, then, a textbook for a basic course in public speaking—no more and no less. It makes no especial contribution to the general theoretical knowledge of speech. It is simple, unpretentious, and yet vigorously and interestingly phrased; it is not only aimed at the beginning student in a speech course, it also regards him purely as a potential speaker. In the world of this textbook, speech is the focus of attention, and the development of speech skills is the great, immediate goal.

Such a text can hardly be anything but 'teachable' and 'learnable.' I have no doubt that many teachers of public speaking will find this book invaluable in their daily work.

MARTIN MALONEY,
Northwestern University

38 BASIC SPEECH EXPERIENCES. A Guide for Student and Teacher. By Clark S. Carlile. St. Louis: John S. Swift Company, 1949; pp. xvi+153.

As the title indicates, this planographed workbook consists of thirty-eight chapters, each dealing with a specific speech assignment. Brief but practical suggestions for the preparation of the speech, including lists of suitable topics, are presented first; then follow some hints on platform presentation, and selected references dealing with the particular type of speech under consideration. At the end of each chapter is a worksheet on which the student may make his outline. It is suggested that this sheet be torn from the book and used by the instructor for criticisms and comments.

The introductory sections present suggestions for finding materials, drawing up outlines, and preparing introductions and conclusions. Assignment sheets in outline form are provided for twenty speeches, five research papers, and eleven tests. Extra outline forms and sheets for student speech appraisals are also included.

Assignments fall under eight general heads: Orientation Speeches; Courtesy Speeches; Commemorative Speeches; Special Speeches; Oral Reading; Parliamentary Law; Discussion and Debate; and Radio Speaking.

A bibliography lists some seventy speech texts. The author suggests that any of these may be used as the basic text for the course, with others employed for supplementary reading. Direct page references are given to each.

In the reviewer's opinion, this workbook would be most useful to the teacher not directly trained in speech. For, though it makes no new contribution to the field, it does present a concise and understandable set of speech assignments, a moderately exhaustive list of reading references in the standard speech texts, and a great many very practical hints and suggestions. Certain of its features may, however, be profitable to all. The presentation of all assignments at the beginning of the course; a standard form for outlines; daily criticism sheets; student appraisal forms; a wide choice of supplementary readings for each assignment—these will make and speech course more efficient in terms of student achievement.

MAX E. FULLER,
Grinnell College

BRIEFLY NOTED

THE LONDON BOOK OF ENGLISH VERSE. Selected by Herbert Read and Bonamy Dobrée. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1949; pp. xxxv+874. $3.75.

Uniform with the popular *London Book of English Prose*, this unusual anthology should be of especial interest to teachers of oral reading.

Forsaking the standard chronological order, the editors have skilfully arranged the selections according to their emotional depth and com-

plexity, as reflected in form, the interplay of stress and meaning, and in music and allusiveness. As a result, they have produced a book which will be of real value in those courses where the student interpreter begins with the reading of simpler verse and is gradually guided into more complex forms.

HOW TO TALK WELL. By James F. Bender. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1949; pp. 262. $3.50.

Drawing upon his extensive experience in teaching speech to adult groups, Bender has produced a popularly written text which covers not only public speaking, but also such diverse matters as conversation, phonetics, vocabulary building, creative listening, and stuttering.

An abundance of exercise material, word games, quizzes, and other learning aids supplement the highly condensed textual material.

Although perhaps of some value to the layman, the teacher of speech will know where to find sounder and more adequate texts for his extension classes.

HANDBOOK OF PUBLIC SPEAKING. By A. R. Thompson. (Revised edition). New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949; pp. xix+177. $1.50.

The revised edition of this pioneer handbook has been somewhat expanded, and contains a short section on speeches for special occasions, as well as additional material on logic and fallacies.

The simplified system of numeration and sounder arrangement of subject-matter should attract those teachers who believe that the principles of oral composition may effectively be presented to students in condensed handbook form.

PUBLIC SPEAKING FOR BUSINESSMEN. By William G. Hoffman. Third edition. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1949; pp. xiii+412. $3.50.

Retaining the same general philosophy and plan of organization found in earlier editions (McGraw-Hill, 1923 and 1931), Hoffman has rewritten a number of the old chapters and added seven new ones in order to bring this well-known textbook 'up to the present "climate of opinion."'

A practical, teachable book, considerably above the level of most popularized treatments of the subject.

THEORY AND TECHNIQUE OF PLAYWRITING AND SCREENWRITING. By John Howard Lawson. (Revised edition). New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1949; pp. +464. $6.00.

The original edition has been brought up to date, and a new section on screenwriting added.

SHOULD THE COMMUNIST PARTY BE OUTLAWED? Compiled by Julia E. Johnsen. The Reference Shelf, Vol. 20, No. 7. New York: The H. W. Wilson Company, 1949; pp. 313. $1.50.

IN THE PERIODICALS

GIRAUD CHESTER, *Editor*

RHETORIC AND PUBLIC ADDRESS
WINSTON L. BREMBECK
University of Wisconsin

RADIO AND TELEVISION
GIRAUD CHESTER
Queens College

DRAMA AND INTERPRETATION
HUGH Z. NORTON
University of Michigan

LANGUAGE AND PHONETICS
HAROLD WEISS
Southern Methodist University

SPEECH SCIENCE
JOHN V. IRWIN
University of Minnesota

THE TEACHING OF SPEECH
GIFFORD S. BLYTON
University of Kentucky

PSYCHOLOGY AND PATHOLOGY OF SPEECH
JACK MATTHEWS
University of Pittsburgh

RHETORIC AND PUBLIC ADDRESS

BRANDES, PAUL, Aristotle for the Undergraduate, *The Southern Speech Journal*, 14 (March 1949).264-9.

Brandes suggests that all speech majors and minors be required to purchase a copy of the Lane Cooper translation of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* as early in their college course as possible; that all speech teachers make a genuine effort to supplement their present text with specific references to the *Rhetoric;* and that 'all speech departments require of their forensic majors a course concerned primarily with the work of Aristotle.'

BROWN, IRA V., Lyman Abbott and Freedmen's Aid, 1865-1869, *The Journal of Southern History*, 15 (February 1949).22-38.

The author discusses the part played by this famous preacher as executive-secretary of the American Freedmen's Union Commission, a league of non-denominational societies formed for the purpose of relief and educational work in the South.

CHASE, NAOMI, Outlining—an Aid to Logical Expression, *The English Journal*, 38 (April 1949).201-3.

'There is no need for outlining unless the student sees a need for it and unless he honestly feels the obligation to develop materials in a form readily understood by his associates. The "outline for outline's sake" is useless busy work.'

DUHAMEL, P. ALBERT, The Function of Rhetoric as Effective Expression, *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 10 (June 1949).344-56.

Consideration is given to some questions of method which must be taken into account in any discussion of rhetoric. The author attempted this 'by an evaluation of the methods and assumptions of some past histories of rhetoric and the illustration of the proposed method by reference to the problems encountered in some periods of rhetorical history.'

FITE, GILBERT C., John A. Simpson: The Southwest's Militant Farm Leader, *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, 35 (March 1949).563-84.

Called the spiritual successor of Kansas' Mary Lease and other fiery Populists, John A. Simpson, the national president of the Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union, 'was for two decades an aggressive left-wing champion of organized farmers and an enthusiastic and ardent advocate of a farmer class movement.'

FITTS, ALBERT N., The Confederate Convention: The Constitutional Debate, *Alabama Review*, 2 (July 1949).189-219.

The author reviews the debate in drafting a permanent constitution for the Confederate States of the South.

FLESCH, RUDOLF, What the War Did to Prose, *Saturday Review of Literature*, 32 (13 August 1949).6-7, 36-7.

'The war, to be sure, gave us many new words, but has it really changed our way of writing?' A specialist in the analysis of literary style presents an answer.

GOSWELL, HAROLD F., and MOYCA C. DAVID, Instruction and Research: Public Opinion Re-

search in Government, *The American Political Science Review*, 43 (June 1949).564-72.

'While the potentiates of public opinion research in the government have only begun to be exploited, administrators and even legislators, who characteristically have been more hostile toward polling, have found methods of testing public opinion answerable to their needs.'

HARDING, HAROLD F., The Principles of Poor Speaking, *The Gavel*, 31 (May 1949).80-1. Reprinted from *The Scientific Monthly* (January 1918).

The author cleverly highlights for the scientific speaker the principles of effective speaking by emphasizing the 'principles of poor speaking.'

HUSBAND, RICHARD WELLINGTON, Techniques of Salesman Selection, *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 9 (Summer 1949).129-48.

A review and evaluation are given of the methods used to select those persons who demonstrate qualities necessary to effective salesmanship.

KRUGMAN, HERBERT E., The Role of Resistance in Propaganda, *International Journal of Opinion and Attitude Research*, 3 (Summer 1949).235-50.

'The effective design of propaganda materials used in attempts to produce qualitative changes in group attitudes is worthy of systematic study.' The author develops certain hypotheses which should be helpful to speakers and writers alike in their concern for the manipulation of human motives.

LEIGHTON, ANN, Conversation, *The Atlantic*, 184 (August 1949).60-2.

The author examines the elements of British Conversation.

LOMAS, CHARLES W., The College Oration and the Classic Tradition, *The Gavel*, 31 (May 1949).78-9.

Critical evaluation is given present-day training in college oratory. A plea is made to 'return to the classical principles of oratory which have been the inspiration of great speakers throughout the Christian era.'

MACLEOD, ROBERT B., Perceptual Constancy and the Problem of Motivation, *Canadian Journal of Psychology*, 3 (June 1949).57-66.

Students of persuation are presented with additional information regarding the bases of human motivation.

MAY, GEORGE S., Parker Pillsbury and Wendell Phillips, *Michigan History*, 33 (June 1949).155-61.

'Among the many interesting events in Ann Arbor's history during the Civil War period, probably none are more revealing of the temper of the times than the appearances of two famous abolitionists in the city and the reactions of the citizens of the town to them. These men were Parker Pillsbury and Wendell Phillips.' The author reviews the newspaper accounts of the speeches and the unrest attending them.

OTIS, JAY L., and WILLIAM C. TREUHAFT, Good Communication Promotes Teamwork, *Personnel Journal*, 28 (July-August 1949).83-90.

A Cleveland manufacturing company reports how discussion between management and labor can effectively promote teamwork in industry.

SANDEFUR, RAY H., The Ingalls-Voorhees Debate of 1888, *The Kansas Historical Quarterly*, 17 (August 1949).243-53.

'One of the bitterest personal debates in Congressional history occurred in the U. S. Senate on April 25 and May 1, 1888, between Senators John J. Ingalls of Kansas and Daniel W. Voorhees of Indiana.' The author reviews this debate which started when Senator Ingalls' speech in favor of a bill to increase pensions for Union soldiers aroused the anger of the 'Tall Sycamore of the Wabash.'

UMBLE, JOHN, John S. Coffman as an Evangelist, *The Mennonite Quarterly Review*, 23(July 1949).123-46.

The content and methods of the preaching of the man who has been considered the chief agent of the Great Awakening of the Mennonite Church are examined and evaluated.

RADIO AND TELEVISION

BARRY, CHARLES C., Tyrants of Television: Inside View, *The Atlantic Monthly*, 183 (April 1949).41-3.

'In television I see the greatest force for understanding, education, entertainment, and participation in human affairs that man has yet devised.' An optimistic report by the vice-president in charge of TV for ABC.

BRYSON, LYMAN and MAHONRI SHARP YOUNG, Radio in America, *The American Scholar*, 17 (Spring 1948).221-9.

An interesting exchange of views on the social and intellectual responsibilities of the radio industry.

CARLSON, EVELYN F., Effective Listening, *Chicago School Journal*, 30 (March 1949).187-91.

An eighth grade social studies teacher describes an effective method of teaching discriminating radio listening habits to news and commentary programs.

CHESTER, GIRAUD, The Press-Radio War: 1933-1935, *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, 13 (Summer 1949).252-64.

'During the past 20 years the attitude of established newspaper publishers and wire services toward radio has ranged from indifference to hostility or cordiality. This account of one phase of the hostile period describes efforts of the American press to limit radio's competition in the news field. It constitutes a dramatic footnote both on the effects of technological change in communications and on the gradual extension of the concept of freedom of information.'

CROSBY, WILLIAM D., Basis of Liability in Radio Defamation, *Boston University Law Journal*, 29 (April 1949).245-50.

'It is submitted that radio defamation is a new tort, the danger of which exceeds all heretofore known means of "blasting" a person's reputation. The basis of liability in defamation should not be relaxed because of technical distinctions which have been proffered by the broadcasting industry.'

DORT, P. H., The BBC Television Newsreel, *The BBC Quarterly*, 3 (January 1949).229-34.

The BBC Television Newsreel came into being in January 1948 and specializes in preparing newsreels running about 15 minutes with not less than two or more than seven minutes devoted to one item. An informed discussion of television newsreel production problems.

EWER, W. N., Mass Persuation through the Microphone, *The BBC Quarterly*, 3 (January 1949).199-204.

'The way in which we write or speak, or read or listen, affects the way in which we think. The radio should diminish, though it will not destroy, the use, and the effect, of highly pitched emotive oratory in relation to international affairs. And if that proves to be so, the gain, though indirect, will be real.'

EXTON, ELAINE, New Developments in Educational Radio and Television, *American School Board Journal*, 118 (April 1949).53-4, 56.

It is 'possible for a school to set up its own FM broadcasting station at a minimum average cost of $6,000. This includes between $1,500 and $2,000 for a 10 watt FM transmitter; approximately $3,000 for studio and control room equipment items, including professional quality magnetic tape recorders; $1,500 for partitioning space for studios and control rooms and for installing the transmitter.' This article contains the latest information on radio and television as they concern school uses.

FCC Attacks Radio Give-Away Programs, *Stanford Law Review*, 1 (April 1949).475-85.

If radio's give-away programs are lotteries, they violate the criminal code and provide the FCC with a basis for refusing to renew licenses. A legal discussion of this question, with a critical note on the FFC's proposed lottery regulations.

GOLDHILL, WALTER A., Censorship of Political Broadcasts, *Yale Law Journal*, 58 (April 1949).787-95.

'A balance must be struck between the goals of free speech and freedom from false and damaging utterances. In the medium of radio, and in the particular field of political broadcasts, the desirability of full and uncensored discussion seems paramount.' A legal note on the Port Huron case.

GREEN, JOHN, 'Farm Radio' in the English-Speaking World, *The BBC Quarterly*, 3 (January 1949).205-11.

A comparison of farm programming in England, Canada, the United States, Australia, and the Union of South Africa.

MCCARTHY, JOE, What Do You Think of Television, Mr. Allen? *Life*, 27 (4 July 1949).69-72.

Some penetrating and witty remarks by Fred Allen on the prospects of TV. 'The screen isn't the only small thing in television. Smallness seems to be the outstanding characteristic of the whole medium right now. It has small minds, small talents, small budgets.'

MILLER, RUTH W., Radio Roads to Reading, *Education*, 69 (May 1949).595-8.

In-school radio listening can be used to motivate and vitalize reading. Some hints on utilization of radio.

MITCHELL, ADELLE H., The Effect of Radio Programs on Silent Reading Achievements of 91 Sixth-grade Students, *Journal of Educational Research*, 42 (February 1949).460-70.

Using the Iowa Silent Reading Test and transcribed variety and musical programs, Miss Mitchell sought to determine experimentally the effect of radio programs on the silent reading achievements of three unselected groups of students. Conclusion: The reading achievement of the whole group was adversely affected by the variety show, but was not so affected by the musical program.

MOTTRAM, V. H., Purpose in the Broadcasting of Science, *The BBC Quarterly*, 3 (January 1949).223-8.

'There is no more important work to be done in the spread of education and of culture than the explanation of what the scientists are "up to," how they carry out their work and what their discoveries mean and portend, in language simple enough to be understood by intelligent people in any walk of life.'

RATCLIFFE, S. K., The influence of Broadcasting on Public Speech, *The BBC Quarterly*, 3 (January 1949).212-6.

The microphone enforces qualities of 'verbal economy, finish, and conversational ease,' a combination 'that has always been rare on the platform.' An interesting discussion of the effect of radio on public speaking.

RILEY, JOHN W., FRANK V. CANTWELL, and KATHERINE F. RUTTIGER, Some Observations on the Social Effects of Television, *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, 13 (Summer 1949).223-34.

'During the summer of 1948, CBS and Rutgers University entered into a joint continuing project to study and document the social consequences of television ownership in a middle-sized eastern city. This paper reports some of the findings from the first phase of the project.'

SCHWARTZ, G. L., Economics on the Air, *The BBC Quarterly*, 3 (January 1949).193-8.

Broadcast talks on economics should avoid 'the esoterics of the subject' and should concentrate instead on the fundamental economic problem: 'the disposal of human effort in a given period of time.' This theme, according to Schwartz, 'deserves laboring even to the point of banality.'

Selected Materials on the Law of Radio and Television, *The Record of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York*, 4 (March 1949).100-4.

A bibliography of materials dealing with radio and TV law.

SMYTHE, DALLAS W., Television: Position and Outlook, *Current Economic Comment*, 11 (February 1949).15-33.

Technical developments and the determination of TV policy by the FCC are the two principal factors on which depends the time when TV will become available to every American home. Smythe thinks TV eventually will replace most AM radio.

SOMERVILLE, T. and S. F. BROWNLESS, Listeners' Sound-Level Preferences, *The BBC Quarterly*, 3 (January 1949).245-50.

This is a report on a BBC 'investigation of the maximum loudness preferred by ordinary listeners, engineers, and musicians, when listening to programs from a loudspeaker.' Symphonic music, light music, dance music, and speech were used in the experiments. Conclusion: 'The public listens at levels which are much lower than those preferred by members of the BBC staff.'

TV: The Money Rolls Out, *Fortune*, 40 (July 1949).72-7, 140ff.

'The concern of this article is the industrial shape of television, its economics, its cost structure—and something of the dislocations it is making on the scene of American enterprise.'

WOOD, HELEN, Employment and Unemployment of Radio Artists, *Monthly Labor Review*, 68 (May 1949).514-16.

The report of a survey of 3,742 radio artists in 15 cities made by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in cooperation with AFRA. Conclusion: Radio actors and singers had a much higher rate of unemployment in the spring of 1948 than did the working population as a whole. 'Most announcers and sound effects men, however, were found to be regularly employed.' (Note: 'Only those artists who had had recent paid employment as radio performers were included in the study.')

DRAMA AND INTERPRETATION

BENTLEY, ERIC, Chekhov as Playwright, *Kenyon Review*, 11 (Spring 1949).226-50.

Bentley has prepared a lengthy defense of Chekhov as a master of dramatic form. He conducts a critical analysis of Chekhov's style by comparing 'Uncle Vanya,' which he considers the mature Chekhov, with 'The Wood Demon,' 'an immature draft.'

BRECHT, BERTOLT, A Model for Epic Theatre, *Swanee Review*, 57 (Summer 1949).426-36.

This is Eric Bentley's translation of the now famous article by Brecht which outlined Brecht's theory of Epic Theatre; i.e., a theatre of 'new forms (or of old forgotten forms) appropriate to the special function of a didactic, political theatre.' Brecht is the most important didactic playwright and most challenging experimentalist in contemporary Germany.

BROWN, J. M., American Tragedy, *Saturday Review of Literature*, 32 (6 August 1949).124-9.

In *Saturday Review's* twenty-fifth anniversary issue, Brown examines his own ideas concerning tragedy in the modern American theatre. O'Neill, Anderson, Williams, and Miller chiefly attract his notice.

CHUTE, MARCHETTE, World Playbill No. 1, *Saturday Review of Literature*, 32 (23 July 1949). 9-11, 30-2.

Chute writes a brief history of the Globe Theatre, its company and the story of their adventure in theatre during Shakespeare's lifetime. 'Shakespeare kept the right company.' They gave him 'their love, their intelligence, and their cooperation.'

FERGUSSON, FRANCIS, Hamlet: The Analogy of Action, *Hudson Review*, 2 (Summer 1949). 165-210.

Fergusson writes an extended analysis of 'Hamlet' and the Elizabethan Theatre with emphasis on the play as Ritual Drama. 'Hamlet was formed in a theatre which was close to the root of drama itself—that art which is both more primitive and more subtle than philosophy. Since the destruction of the great mirror of the Elizabethan Theatre, it has been necessary to restore or invent the theatre,' in a succession of more limited *genres*, Fergusson says.

FERGUSSON, FRANCIS, Sartre as Playwright, *Partisan Review*, 16 (April 1949).407-11.

Fergusson offers 'a few observations on Sartre's dramaturgy, and on his sudden career in the American Theatre.' His text is three of Sartre's plays: 'No Exit,' 'The Victors,' 'Red Gloves.' 'Our dispersed, spasmodic and undernourished theatre has nothing to digest him with,' Fergusson concludes.

FERGUSSON, FRANCIS, The Theatricality of Shaw and Pirandello, *Partisan Review*, 16 (June 1949).589-603.

The ways in which two distinguished and very different authors have returned to theatrical convention are explored by Fergusson. They represent significant modern departures from realism by Shaw and Pirandello respectively along the lines of comic invention and poetic imagination.

GREENHUT, MORRIS, G. H. Lewes's Criticism of the Drama, *PMLA*, 64 (June 1949).350-68.

Greenhut writes an extended analysis of the criticism of one of the greatest, perhaps the greatest, of England's professional theatre critics.

HACKETT, WALTER, The One-Act Play Is the Thing, *Writer*, 62 (July 1949).224-7.

Hackett gives practical advice of all sorts to the much needed writer of one-act plays.

HELD, MCDONALD, Stage Construction and Equipment, *Southern Speech Journal*, 14 (March 1949).278-83.

At a sectional meeting on theatre in April 1948, Held presented this practical and detailed comment on the stage, its mechanical equipment, and electrical equipment for the average educational institution.

HUGHES, GLENN, The Developments in Drama, *Western Speech*, 13 (January 1949).15-8.

Developments in fields are often brought about by developments in individuals. Characteristics of many developments in drama in the West are the personal experiences of Glenn Hughes. He relates these in a semi-autobiographical way.

LAUGHLIN, RICHARD L., A Philosophy of Comedy, *Educational Forum*, 13 (January 1949).165-70.

Laughlin surveys the theories of a number of important thinkers on the subject, and, having 'chopped down or pruned' away most of them, he comes at last to his own point of view. A bibliography is appended.

MALNICK, BERTHA, The Moscow Art Theatre—A Jubilee, *Slavonic and East European Review*, 27 (May 1949).563-70.

On the fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the Moscow Art Theatre, Malnick relates how it came into being and how difficult was the evolution that led to its pre-eminence.

NATHAN, G. J., Lo, the Poor Critic, *American Mercury*, 68 (March 1949).291-5.

Nathan bleeds for the modern professional theatre critic. He concludes that 'he is, in short, a black sheep—in a pack of jackasses.'

PROKOFIEV, V., A Great Reformer of Theatrical Art, *Soviet Literature*, 2 (1949).137-42.

This is another highly informative article celebrating the fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the Moscow Art Theatre. It is concerned chiefly with Stanislavsky himself rather than his theatre as an organization.

SHAW, G .B., Shaw's Rules for Directors, *Theatre Arts*, 33 (August 1949).6-11.

'These pages are an attempt to supply a beginners' guide. They are not concerned with direction as a fine art; but they cover the mechanical and teachable conditions which are common to all productions.'

SOUTHERN, RICHARD, The 'Houses' of the Westminster Play, *Theatre Notebook*, 3 (April-June 1949).46-52.

Herein is discussed an aspect of medieval and renaissance staging which is of considerable significance to the understanding of the history of English stage scenery. The discussion concerns 'houses' or small constructions set up to represent separate items of a simultaneous setting—or later, the side elements of 'prospective scenes.' The proscenium was derived from these. There are several illustrations.

SYLVESTER, ROBERT, Brooklyn Boy Makes Good, *Saturday Evening Post*, 222 (16 July 1949). 26-7, 97-8, 100.

Sylvester writes a popular, albeit a very informative, article on the American playwright, Arthur Miller. Miller comments on the new trend in staging.

VOORHEES, LILLIAN W., What Price Negro Drama? *Southern Speech Journal*, 14 (January 1949).176-84.

This is an inspiring and optimistic treatment of the possibilities for Negro theatre in the schools today. Many suggestions for plays are made along with comments on past productions.

LANGUAGES AND PHONETICS

ABERCROMBIE, DAVID, Teaching Pronunciation, *English Language Teaching*, 3 (February 1949). 113-22.

All teachers of languages are phoneticians whether they know it or not. The student of phonetic principles should guard against misplaced zeal in phonetics, such as over-emphasizing transcription; he should recognize the need for sensible standards of performance in pronunciation of a foreign language.

BROWN, JAMES I., Reading and Vocabulary: 14 Master Words, *Word Study*, 24 (May 1949).1-4.

A study unit is outlined to build the college freshman's vocabulary. Fourteen words, their root meanings and the meanings of their prefixes, are labeled as keys to the meanings of 14,000 words. Listed are the methods for studying these words in coordination with the dictionary, as well as a preliminary study showing the improvement made by a group of students who had ranked extremely low on reading tests in the beginning of the quarter.

DYKEMA, KARL W., The Grammar of Spoken English: Its Relation to What Is Called English Grammar, *American Speech*, 24 (February 1949).43-8.

Dykema asserts that there is a great need to develop an English grammar based on the spoken language. With the advent of electronic devices, grammarians ought to be able to record a wealth of evidence to codify spoken grammar.

FORAN, T. G., Language, Meaning, and Reading, *Catholic Educational Review*, 47 (April 1949).234-41.

The author castigates Bloomfield's ideas on the teaching of reading by the 'alphabetic method.' He points out a difference between learning to read 'phonically' and learning to read 'meaningfully.' The writer is astonished to find adherents of Scholastic principles adopting and professing Behavioristic practices in the teaching of reading.

HAYMON, SYLVIA T., Words for Pleasure, *Word Study*, 24 (May 1949).6-7.

This article illustrates the advent of the Norman French 'seasoning' to the English language. As part of a book on words that Mrs. Haymon is writing for younger readers, it indicates that the Norman influence was a touch of French refinement added to the forthright Anglo-Saxon-Norse mixture.

HILL, ARCHIBALD A., A Survey of Accomplishments and Trends in Research in Present-Day English, *American Speech*, 24 (April 1949).81-9.

This review of modern research includes mention of the work on the *Linguistic Atlas*, investigations in foreign language areas in the United States and other material in the field of dialectology. New dictionaries and other lexicographical works are cited.

LANGER, SUZANNE K., Symbols and Emblems, *Common Cause*, 2 (April 1949).338-40.

The world has become one community and needs a universal emblem or symbol, not dependent on poetic association for meaning, but expressive by virtue of its direct visual character. The writer suggests the logarithmic spiral to meet this need. Illustrations indicate how this symbol may be combined with other international agency emblems.

LEOPOLD, W. F., Original Invention in Infant Language, *Symposium*, 3 (May 1949).66-73.

The author studied the evolution of speech in his daughter who had been exposed to English and German. Many interesting examples of coinage of words and phrases in both languages are noted.

LEWIS, NORMAN, How Correct Must Correct English Be? *Harpers Magazine*, 198 (March 1949). 68-74.

Nineteen sentences illustrating moot points in modern grammatic argument, e.g. 'It is me. Who did you meet?' were sent to 750 people for rejection or acceptance. The college professors of English proved the most liberal; editors of women's magazines, the most conservative. The author concludes that 'correct' and 'incorrect' are subtle, intangible, relative terms and that adherence to rules is not charactertistic of the educated speaker in America.

MCDAVID, RAVEN I. JR., Grist from the Atlas Mill, *American Speech*, 24 (April 1949).105-14.

This lexicon contains 350 terms not covered in the regular worksheets for the *Linguistic Atlas of the South Atlantic States*, thus supplying information that will not be published in the forthcoming *Atlas* additions.

PIKE, EVELYN G., Controlled Infant Intonation, *Language Learning*, 2 (January-March 1949). 21-4.

An experiment with her own child convinced the author that children mimic pitch very early in life, that those patterns used by their elders spoken directly to them are the ones children learn first. If a child's speech is to have normal English intonation, those who work with the child must modify their intonation to conform to what is normal for the kind of responses the child is learning to make.

SAHLMAN, SELMA SIIRI, The Finnish Language in the United States, *American Speech*, 24 (February 1949).14-24.

The Finnish language has developed a nationalistic purism in recent years, while the Swedish influence is being cast off. Thus, American Finns, whose language the author labels 'Finglish,' have difficulty in communicating with recent arrivals from Finland. 'Finglish' seems to be a doomed dialect.

SPALDING, K., The Idiom of a Revolution: Berlin 1848, *The Modern Language Review*, 44 (January 1949).60-74.

This article examines the language contained in the political broadcasts published in Berlin during the upheavals of 1848. Language habits that were made popular did service long after the broad-sheets had been driven underground.

SPARKMAN, COLLEY F., A New Language Must Be Spliced Onto One's Native Tongue, *The Modern Language Journal*, 33 (May 1949). 355-62.

A new language should be taught with a rationalized technique rather than by an oral 'natural' method. One should utilize the thousands of concepts already formed and follow a visual approach, but should not expect great facility in oral use of the new language.

THE TEACHING OF SPEECH

BOLT, L. K., Speech in the High School, *Teachers College Journal*, 20 (March 1949).84-5.

Prospective high school speech teachers in Indiana desired to know the status of high school speech education in their state. This article

gives the result of their survey and a detailed study of the laboratory school of Indiana State Teachers College.

CHISHOLM, FRANCIS, The Communication Course in General Education, *Teachers College Journal*, 20 (May-June 1949).98-9.

If a college accepts 'the responsibility of helping each student become a mature, responsible citizen,' then its traditional assumptions concerning the English and Speech departments must change. The course in communications described here is the River Falls Wisconsin State Teachers College solution to the problem.

FITCH, WARING, What Is Speech Improvement? How to Teach It, *Grade Teacher*, 66 (April 1949).28.

Suggestions for the teacher's own speech improvement as well as a plan for helping her pupils improve their speech.

GILKINSON, HOWARD, Research in Speech Education, *Review of Educational Research*, 19 (April 1949).152-7.

A review of major research, monographs and reports in the field of speech education since April 1946.

MCMILLIN, M. P., Oral Speech Drills for Grade 8, *Grade Teacher*, 66 (June 1949).10.

An outline of the essential points which eighth graders should be taught in five types of Oral English: Conversation, discussion, dramatization, demonstration of activity, and oral reading.

WALLACE, KARL, Research in Public Address and the Teaching of Public Speaking, *Southern Speech Journal*, 14 (January 1949).170-5.

Research is not 'a large chore set by stone-hearted professors to make a Ph.D. degree difficult to obtain.' Persistent research frequently makes better teachers by enlarging their conception of their chosen field and enriching their resources as instructors.

WALSH, L., Better Teaching through Better Discussion, *Practical Home Economics*, 27 (June 1949).312.

Discussion on a low level can be just as unexciting as the old-time question-and-answer recitation. A truly worth-while class discussion requires a great deal of preparation on the part of the teacher. Miss Walsh suggests several steps towards making classroom discussions truly educational.

WEDBERG, CONRAD, I Dot a Wed Twuck, *National Education Association Journal*, 38(February 1949).131-2.

'A follow-up, carry-over, habit-forming speech-improvement program in the classroom is just as indispensable as the special speech correction clinic.'

SPEECH SCIENCE

BEKESY, GEORG V., On the Resonance Curve and the Decay Period at Various Points on the Cochlear Partition, *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 21 (May 1949).245-54.

'The anatomy of the cochlea is such that vibrations of various frequencies transmitted from the stapes are, to a certain degree, spatially separated along the cochlear partition. In this paper, we shall examine to what extent the amplitude of vibration of the partition exhibits such a spatial separation for the different frequencies, and what decay times are associated with this mechanical analysis of frequency.'

BEKESY, GEORG V., The Structure of the Middle Ear and the Hearing of One's Own Voice by Bone Conduction, *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 21 (May 1949).217-32.

This paper 'reviews the physical considerations having to do with the middle ear that increase the sensitivity of the ear to sounds coming from the outside and at the same time decrease its sensitivity to sounds produced by the organism itself.' Békésy adds that, in terms consistent with these assumptions, it is possible to explain such questions as why animals have two vocal cords and why a bony rod lies on the eardrum.

BEKESY, GEORG V., Vibration of the Cochlear Partitions in Anatomical Preparations and in Models of the Inner Ear, *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 21 (May 1949).233-45.

'These experiments make it plain that the pattern of vibration of the cochlear partition is determined primarily by the volume elasticity of the membrane and the fluid close to the membrane. Length, height, shape, and diameter of the cochlear canal do not influence the vibration pattern. A mathematical description of the hydrodynamic properties of the inner ear must take into consideration this independence of the physical dimensions of the cochlear canal.'

BERANEK, LEO L., A Report on the International Conference on Acoustics, London, 1948, *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 21 (May 1949).264-9.

Beranek's report summarizes certain papers presented at the conference under these headings: Building Acoustics and Standards; Acoustics of Ancient Theatres; Annoyances of Radio Interference; Measurement of Noise; and Miscellaneous Papers. The section on noise measurement should be of particular interest to experimental phoneticians.

GOLDSETH, JAMES G. and O. LEONARD HUDDLESTON, Electromyographic Diagnosis of Lower Motor Neuron Disease, *Archives of Physical Medicine*, 30 (August 1949).495-500.

The authors discuss the characteristic voltages generated by normal and abnormal voluntary muscles and describe some of the commoner conditions under which abnormal electromyograms are obtained. They conclude that the 'electromyograph affords an objective test for assessing the functional integrity of the final common path and, because of its objectiveness, it is proving itself to be invaluable in medicolegal work for differentiating among lower motor neuron disease, hysteria, and malingering.'

GRIESMAN, BRUNO L., Suspension Mechanism of the Upper Lip and the Columella, *Archives of Otolaryngology*, 50 (July 1949).36-44.

Movements of the upper lip play an important role in eating, sucking, speaking, singing, whispering, laughing, etc. Griesman describes the suspension of the upper lip as a complex system of crisscrossing fibers similar to the so-called extension bracket used to bring forward electrical equipment from the wall. He concludes: 'This extension, bracket-like device makes possible the continuously changing position of the upper lip during eating, speaking, and facial expression.'

GUILD, STACY R., Hearing Tests and Testing, *The Laryngoscope*, 59 (June 1949).674-9.

Guild summarizes concisely the many types of hearing tests that are now available. He concludes that 'the knowledge needed to interpret hearing tests intelligently has not increased as rapidly as have testing techniques. Factual information about the physiology of the organ of hearing, which includes parts of the brain, is as yet so incomplete that for many hearing tests hypothetical interpretations only can be made with respect to lesions possibly responsible for an impaired function revealed and measured by the tests.'

LEIRI, F., The Acoustic Function of the Inner Ear, *Acta-Oto-Laryngologica*, 37 (February 1949) Fasc. I, 37-43.

Leiri suggests that 'sound perception in the inner ear is mediated by relay-devices which in structure and manner of acting resemble loudspeakers, electrodynamic and capacitive, in radio and sound-film technique of today. The electric power for the "microphones" in the ear is obtained from a streaming potential arising in vas spirale of the art. audivata int.' He adds that his investigations of difference and summation tones—two tones striking the ear—show combination oscillations analagous to those occurring due to interference.

LEISTI, TIMO, On Speech Audiograms, *Acta-Oto-Laryngologica*, 37 (June 1949)Fasc. III, 256-7.

Leisti describes a technique for making speech audiograms. He makes comparison of three such audiograms with conventional pure tone audiograms of the same three subjects.

POLLACK, IRWIN, The Effect of White Noise on the Loudness of Speech of Assigned Average Level, *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 21 (May 1949). 255-8.

The effect of noise on the subjective evaluation of the loudness of recorded speech was determined by having listeners adjust the level of recorded speech heard in quiet so that it sounded equal in loudness to recorded speech presented against selected levels of background noise. 'The assumption that a given level of noise subtracts a *constant* number of loudness units from speech was found to be fairly adequate in describing the experimental results.'

SULLIVAN, JOSEPH A., C. C. GOTLIEB, and W. E. HODGES, The Human Ear as an Analyzer of Sound, *The Laryngoscope*, 59 (July 1949).764-70.

The authors describe a complex tone generator with which the harmonics of the fundamental frequency of the complex tone can be cancelled. Subjects were asked to judge subjectively the presence or absence of a given harmonic component. The authors conclude 'the ear is able to judge exactly when a given harmonic is absent from a complex tone, and thus can perform a quantitative structural analysis of a complex sound.'

PSYCHOLOGY AND PATHOLOGY OF SPEECH

ANONYMOUS, We Made Our Child Stutter, *Parents'*, (April 1949).38, 131-2.

A mother writes of her young son who became a stutterer, she believes, because of his parents' excessive demands and rapid living. The stuttering is now improving with the help of a university speech clinic and the parents' new realization of their responsibility to their child and his speech.

BROWD, VICTOR L., Hearing Re-education without the Use of Hearing Aids, *Archives of Otolaryngology*, 49 (May 1949).511-28.

The author directs attention to the possibility that auditory re-education may be of use to those unable to wear a hearing aid. Such a re-education program is described and the results of its use with 50 cases are listed.

CROSSLAND, J. H., Some Wider Aspects of the Management of Cerebral Palsy, *Occupational Therapy and Rehabilitation*, 28 (June 1949).227-30.

The current tendency to adjust the child to the treatment rather than vice versa is criticized. Emphasis is placed upon an early start followed by long and patient training in the rehabilitation of the severely afflicted. The importance of the parental role and the child's own desire to get well is also stressed.

CURRY, E. THAYER, The Relations between Hearing Loss for Specific Frequencies and the Distance at Which Speech Can Be Identified, *The Annals of Otology, Rhinology, and Laryngology*, 58 (March 1949).32-8.

This study was an attempt to determine the relative contributions made by individual frequencies to the identification of the spoken voice. The specific purpose was to examine the relation between the two measures: 1. air conduction and bone conduction loss in decibels for the individual frequencies 256, 512, 1024, 2045, and 2. the distance measured in feet at which the spoken digits could be identified. For the 156 ears in the study (of a specific group of cases, in a specific testing room, with a particular speaking voice) the individual audiometer frequency values (either air conduction or bone conduction) for decibel loss indicate little statistical association with the spoken speech score.

FARRIOR, J. BROWN, The Fenestration Operation —Indications, Techniques and Results, *The Laryngoscope*, 59 (May 1949).515-39.

This is the report of the techniques by which the author chooses candidates for the operation, the operative procedures, and the results in 144 cases.

FOWLER, E. P., 'Otosclerosis,' An Index of the Literature, with Abstracts, for 1947, *Archives of Otolaryngology*, 49 (June 1949).645-81.

In informational list of translated abstracts published in Europe in 1947.

GARDNER, ALVIN F., Dental, Oral, and General Causes of Speech Pathology, *Oral Surgery, Oral Medicine, and Oral Pathology*, 2 (June 1949).742-51.

The author reviews the development of speech in children, outlines several of the speech defects, and discusses etiology and treatment. The emphasis of the article is on speech difficulties resulting from structural anomalies.

GENS, GEORGE A., Let's Be Realistic about Aphasics, *Training School Bulletin*, 46 (May-June 1949).49-57.

An outline of a speech retraining program for aphasics.

GRABER, T. M., An Appraisal of the Developmental Deformities in Cleft-Palate and Cleft-Lip Individuals, *Quarterly Bulletin of Northwestern University Medical School*, 23 (Summer 1949).153-69.

The author reviews the history of cleft palate repair and then goes into his findings resulting from a study of anthropometric landmarks through the use of Broadbent-Bolton Cephalometers. He found that more normal maxillary development takes place in cleftpalate patients who have not been operated upon; that it seems advisable to postpone such operations until the patient is at least four years old; that prosthetic appliances seem quite successful.

KEASTER, JACQUELINE, Communication Techniques for Hard of Hearing, *Transactions of American Academy of Opthalmology and Otolaryngology*, (May-June 1949).581-3.

Deaf children can be taught speech that will serve as a satisfactory means of communication. Parents can do much to prepare a child for speech before he goes to school. Hard-of-hearing children may have speech problems which can be helped by visual, auditory, and kinesthetic means.

NEWS AND NOTES

ROBERT F. RAY, *Editor*

To all members of the SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA:

The News and Notes section of the QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH *is designed to report newsworthy items of interest to members of the* ASSOCIATION. *In it are reported the Plans and Progress of departments of speech; new appointments; in a section On The Stages the schedules of plays that are presented in college and university theatres; reports of conferences and news that is made At The Meetings; Personal Notes; and Obituaries.*

All members of the ASSOCIATION *are invited to help report the news to the News and Notes Editor. Please send news about yourself, your department, and your colleagues. Deadlines are as follows: for the February issue November 1, for the April issue January 5, for the October issue July 1, for the December issue September 1.*

Send your material to Robert F. Ray, The Institute of Public Affairs, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.

PLANS AND PROGRESS

AT BUTLER UNIVERSITY: A new department of speech and drama was established September first with George P. Rice, Jr. as chairman.

AT THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS: Each year a few specially qualified students will be admitted to a program of graduate study leading to the doctorate in mass communications. It is an *interdepartmental* program, designed to apply the methods and disciplines of the social sciences (supported where necessary by the arts and natural sciences) to the basic problems of communication. It is a *research* program, intended to encourage the development of research and research men, in order to supply verifiable information in the areas of press, radio, and pictures where the hunch, the tradition, the theory, and the thumb have too often ruled. It is a *specialized* program for candidates who have had considerable background before entering, and whose plans for careers are such as to make this interdepartmental degree more desirable than a degree in one of the social sciences. The university hopes that the new program, being put into effect this semester, will contribute to the better teaching of communications, the better understanding of communications, and the maximum use of communications for the public good. The program is sponsored by the university's Institute of Communications Research, and administered by an interdepartmental committee appointed by the dean of the Graduate College. Chairman of the Committee is Wilbur Schramm.

Plans for the expansion of the forensics program at the University of Illinois include the addition of Glenn Reddick, formerly of the University of Florida, as moderator of Illini Radio Forum, a position vacated by Howard Shuman who is doing advanced work at Oxford University. Under the direction of Halbert E. Gulley, Supervisor of Forensics, the staff is planning to inaugurate a series of community forums on the United Nations.

The Fifth Annual Summer Residential Speech Center at the University of Illinois treated fifty persons who ranged in age from seven to nineteen, for hearing loss, cerebral palsy, and post-operative cleft palate. Those treated came from thirty-seven counties. Thirty-seven certified clinicians were in attendance.

A new speech laboratory has been established at Illinois, under the directorship of Grant Fairbanks, to furnish facilities for student and faculty research in both normal and disordered speech and hearing, and to serve graduate instruction. The laboratory occupies approximately 7500 square feet of space in a permanent building, remodeled to provide suitable conditions for acoustical, physiological, and psychological investigation. Equipment covers the full range of modern research instrumentation.

AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND: The extension work offered in the field of public speaking for the various military establishments in the Washington area has been greatly increased. Fifteen classes are functioning for the fall semester with the Pentagon leading with five classes. Other centers are at: Fort Myer, Aberdeen Proving Ground, Fort Meade, Walter Reed General Hospital, and Bolling Field.

AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI: The Radio-TV Department will offer for the first time this semester a course in motion picture production specifically designed to produce films for television. The new course will be taught by Grant E. Shepard of Hollywood who received a master's degree in motion pictures from the University of California at Los Angeles in August. Stu-

dents in the six-hour motion picture workshop may earn three credits toward their degrees. Projects in the course will include production of titles, outdoor sequences, and special effects for integration with live television productions. Motion picture production for video will tie in with existing courses, including a television workshop, a script-writing laboratory, and a lecture course introducing students to the general field of television.

AT THE UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH: By action of the university's board of trustees at their July meeting, the Speech Division has been separated from the English Department. It is now the Department of Speech with Professor Buell Whitehill, Jr. as the head of the department. Fifty-two courses will be offered, and the speech faculty will number twenty-four. New remedial courses in speech, approved by the college faculty last year, will be given all freshmen in need of these courses. Other new courses being offered by the department include an evening speech class in playwriting which will study the techniques of drama through writing, conferences, and several day courses. Among the day courses are a workshop in forensics designed especially for the high school director of debate and forensics, a creative drama class which studies the techniques for developing the play, and a class in acting which studies the techniques and methods of acting.

AT THE SOUTH DAKOTA SCHOOL OF MINES AND TECHNOLOGY: For the first time, courses are being offered this semester in radio broadcasting techniques under the supervision of W. Ferron Halvorson, WCAT director. WCAT, owned by the college, is one of the earliest pioneers in the field of radio broadcasting. The series of courses begins with a practical course in announcing. The course deals with the fundamentals of speaking on the radio, analysis of audience situations, and special practice in handling spot announcements, interviewing, and the conducting of various kinds of discussion and audience participation programs, news, sports, and special events announcing. During the winter quarter, intensive class participation will be permitted in producing and directing radio talks, round tables, dramatic and documentary programs. The spring course will be devoted to a study of the psychology of radio, listener habits, planning of the individual program, problems of programming a station, 'good taste' and code, and evaluating various types of commercial and sustaining programs.

AT THE UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA: The School of Speech and Drama increased its course offerings, especially in graduate studies, during the past summer, and continued its intensive training programs in drama and speech correction. Courses in public address, teaching problems, and graduate methods were taught by Russell H. Wagner, and in voice training and bases of speech by Curtis L. Pope of the University of Iowa. The summer session of theatre arts, as in its first session last year, combined an intensive production schedule with a wide offering of courses including three on the graduate level. Student enrollment showed an increase of slightly more than fifty per cent over the initial summer, and audience attendance at the productions increased ten per cent. Six major productions were presented during the eight weeks' term for a total of nineteen performances. For the third successive summer the university speech and hearing clinic, under the direction of J. M. Mullendore and assisted by H. H. Perritt and Douglas Ehninger, conducted an intensive program in training teachers in speech correction. A new feature in the speech and hearing program this summer was Camp Woodrow Wilson, a camp for speech defective children, sponsored jointly by the university and the Virginia Society. Located in permanent buildings near Fishersville, Virginia, this camp was attended by twenty children with cleft palate speech, articulatory defects, and delayed speech. Three speech therapists and two recereational directors were on the camp staff. Students in the speech correction program at the university were able to visit the camp regularly and to observe the methods used there.

APPOINTMENTS

AT AUBURN COLLEGE: Shirley Brigance has been added to the speech staff. Miss Brigance received the bachelor's degree from Miami University in 1947 and the master's degree from Ohio State University in 1949.

AT THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA: Roger M. Busfield, Jr., has been added to the staff of the Department of Speech. Mr. Busfield was formerly at Southwestern University, Georgetown, Texas.

AT THE UNIVERSITY OF DENVER: Mary Jaeger, who received the bachelor's degree from the University of Iowa and the master's degree in speech from the University of Denver this past summer, and Rosabel Ray, who received the bachelor's degree from Denver University and the master's degree from the University of Michigan,

have been appointed instructors in speech correction and audiology in the School of Speech.

R. E. Shutts has been appointed to serve as director of the Intermediate-Adult Speech Clinic and the newly expanded Reading Clinic at the University of Denver.

At Florida State University: Additions to the faculty of the department of Speech include Gregg Phifer, doctorate, Iowa; Wayne Minnick, doctorate, Northwestern; Thomas R. Lewis, doctorate, Iowa; Stanley Ainsworth, doctorate, Northwestern; George McCalmon, doctorate, Western Reserve; and Dean Williams, master's, Iowa.

At Fordham University: Edgar L. Kloten has been named chairman of the theatre division and director of the Fordham University Theatre under the Department of Communication Arts. Mr. Kloten has been at Fordham since 1946 as assistant professor of drama.

New lecturers in the theatre division at Fordham include Frank Ford, who will lecture on American drama and conduct a seminar in advanced playwriting; Kathleen O'Brien, who will conduct a class in theatre dance fundamentals; Joan O'Byrne, who will offer a class in dramatic interpretation; and Dorothy Croissant, who will handle the class in costume design.

At the University of Illinois: New appointments in the Department of Speech include the following: George J. Wischner, assistant professor of speech and psychology, formerly with the Child Welfare Research Station, University of Iowa; as full-time assistant, Glenn E. Reddick, from the University of Florida; as part-time assistants: Phyllis Ruth Arnold, Helen Buliga, Ruby Lee Draughon, Helen K. Finlay, Philip R. Hanson, John F. Kingston, George Kurtzrock, Orville Larson, John McMullen, Elizabeth Schieferstein, Adam Sortini, Howard Grigsby, E. H. Lazerson, and Bruce Youle.

At Indiana University: Raymond G. Smith, who was on leave during the 1948-49 academic year completing work for the doctorate at the University of Wisconsin, returned in September as assistant professor to direct the work in public speaking. Marion Gaber, who completed the course requirement for the doctorate at Stanford University, has been appointed assistant professor in speech. R. Lyle Hagan, who received the doctorate from Western Reserve University in August, has been appointed assistant professor in speech. Warren Clymer of the University of Iowa has been appointed teaching fellow and assistant technical director of the university theatre. Margaret O'Sullivan has been appointed instructor in the speech clinic.

At Louisiana State University: Don F. Blakely, who taught at Purdue University last year, has been appointed technical director.

At the University of Missouri: J. P. Ryan, formerly of Grinnell College, has joined the staff of the Department of Speech as visiting professor. He is offering advanced courses in public address. Frank M. Rarig, formerly of the University of Minnesota, continues for the second year as visiting professor with advanced courses in oral interpretation. Clifton Cornwell, Jr., formerly of the University of Hawaii, has accepted the appointment of director of forensics and instructor in speech. Mr. Cornwell will continue study towards the doctorate at Missouri.

At the University of Pittsburgh: Joe Ball, from the University of Southern California, has been put in charge of the program of remedial speech, instituted this semester. Mildred Ann Ditty, from Allegheny College, has been appointed as instructor to teach public speaking and to direct women's debate. Betty Jane McWilliams, from Ohio State University, has been appointed as a lecturer in speech.

At San Jose State College: Berneice Prisk has been appointed to head costume work, and Alden Smith will teach voice and diction. Miss Prisk comes from the University of Iowa where she has been head costumer for the last five years. Mr. Smith has the master's degree from the College of Pacific, and has also studied at the Sorbonne.

At Stephen F. Austin State College: Robert B. Capel, formerly professor of speech at Northwestern State College, has been named head of the newly-formed Department of Speech.

At Washington Missionary College, Washington, D.C.: Branka Bogdanovich has joined the Department of Speech as instructor. Miss Bogdanovich received the master's degree from Northwestern in the spring.

At West Virginia University: Vincent H. Knauf has been appointed assistant professor and director of the speech clinic. Venton Scott has been named instructor in public speaking, and Dorothy Jane Rensch has been appointed to teach radio and public speaking. Jane Baker has been named instructor in interpretation and voice and diction.

At Whittier College: Clayton Briggs of the University of Maine has replaced Rollin Buck-

man as technical director of the college theatre. Lester Harris has been engaged on a half-time basis as supervisor of the speech and hearing clinic. He will conduct the work under the direction of Alfred Larr, who will devote more of his time to teaching in the field of speech correction. Tom Elder will act as clinical assistant under Mr. Harris. Dave Krouger will act as head coach in the oral basic communications course. De Lisle Crawford returns to Whittier as director of the College Theatre after a summer at New York University.

ON THE STAGES

At Antelope Valley, Lancaster, California: Six plays have been produced under the direction of Robert O. Hahn, graduate of Hamilton College, who studied drama at Syracuse University and at Fordham. The plays were sponsored by Antelope Valley Joint Union High School and Junior College.

At Howard University: Twenty-one university students, accompanied by three faculty members, left New York on the *S. S. Stavangerfjord* in September to make a series of guest performances in Norway, Denmark, and Sweden at the invitation of the Norwegian government. Appearances are on a non-profit basis, with income from ticket sales covering all of the group's expenses while in Scandinavia. Transportation costs were met by funds made available through the offices of the Norwegian Cultural Attaché and through the generosity of a private donor, Blevins Davis, who sponsored the first appearance of American actors at Denmark's International Hamlet Festival at Elsinore, Denmark, in June. The plays which are being presented are 'The Wild Duck' by Henrik Ibsen and 'Mamba's Daughters' by Du Bose Heyward. Under the direction of Anne Cooke, the Howard University Players opened their tour in mid-September with a six-day appearance at the New Theatre in Oslo.

At the University of Illinois: Among the offerings of the Illini Theatre Guild in the 1949-50 season will be a production of 'Much Ado about Nothing' on the Guild's replica of the Globe Stage. Two operas are also on the schedule: 'The Medium,' together with a new short opera by Burrell Phillips, a distinguished American composer who joined the University of Illinois School in September. The operas will be directed by Ludwig Zirner, who during the past summer served as assistant to Serge Koussevitsky at the Berkshire Music Festival.

At Indiana University: The university theatre and the National Thespian Society co-sponsored the Third National Dramatic Arts Conference at Indiana University in June. A thousand students, teachers, and members of the professional theatre attended. Principal addresses were delivered by Marc Connelly on playwriting; Sterling Fisher on television; Norris Houghton on professional productions; C. Lawton Campbell on a national theatre. The university theatre formed and operated a summer stock company known as the Brown County Playhouse at Nashville, Indiana, July 15 through September 18. So far as is known this is the only county seat in the United States having no movie house and supporting a resident stock company. The university theatre and the School of Music jointly produced 'The Merry Widow' during the summer session. In October the university theatre presented 'An Inspector Calls' at the Murat Theatre in Indianapolis for the Indiana State Teachers Association. Other plays to be offered in the 1949-50 season include 'John Loves Mary,' 'The Young and the Fair,' 'Pygmalion,' 'Medea,' 'Don't Go Away Mad,' and 'The Music Master.'

At Louisiana State University: An original three-act play entitled, 'Escape from Shadows,' written by Charlotte Searles of the staff of radio station WLSU, was presented as the first major production of the summer session. The second production was A. A. Milne's 'Mr. Pim Passes By.' Plays to be given for fall production are 'The Heiress,' and 'The Insect Comedy.'

At the University of Pittsburgh: Spring and summer productions by the Pitt Players included 'The Winslow Boy,' 'The Flies,' and 'Philadelphia Story.'

At San Jose State College: The following plays have been selected by the Department of Speech and Drama for the 1949-50 season: 'Faust,' 'John Loves Mary,' 'Taming of the Shrew,' 'Tonight at 8:30,' 'The Corn is Green,' and 'Time and the Conways.'

At Stanford University: The world première of 'Now I Lay Me Down to Sleep,' from Bemelman's novel, was adapted for the stage by Elaine Ryan and produced at Stanford with a combined professional and university staff. Hume Cronyn directed the production with Jessica Tandy as Miss Graves and Akim Tamiroff as General Erosa.

At West Virginia University: The 1949-50 drama season will include 'Night Must Fall,' 'Helena's Husband,' 'Androcles and the Lion,' 'All My Sons,' 'Life with Father,' and a children's theatre production not yet selected.

AT THE MEETINGS

AT ALABAMA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE: The Speech Division held its first Annual Conference on Speech and Hearing Defects this summer. O. F. Wise, state director of the Vocational Rehabilitation Service, gave the principal address, Vocational Handicaps of the Speech and Hearing Defective Person. The conference, under the direction of E. K. Jerome, director of the speech clinic at Auburn, had two main divisions: The Speech and Hearing Defective Child in Society, and Articulation Testing and Re-education.

AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII: Under the auspices of the Speech Department and the Department of Public Instruction, the First Pacific Speech Conference was held in April. Temporary officers were elected and charged with the responsibility of forming a permanent organization. Joseph F. Smith was elected temporary chairman, and Richard A. Parry was elected temporary secretary.

AT LOUISIANA UNIVERSITY: The Fifteenth Annual Conference on Speech Education was held in June. The speaker was Gordon E. Peterson, research scientist of Bell Telephone Laboratories, Murray Hill, New Jersey. Dr. Peterson spoke on a series of subjects in audiology, and demonstrated the spectrograph or visible speech machine with which experimentation is under way in the laboratories.

The new officers of Louisiana Speech and Hearing Association are as follows: President, Lou Kennedy, director of speech and hearing clinic at Louisiana State University, and secretary, Quintilla Anders Lewis, speech clinician in Ascension Parish.

AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI: Donald C. Bryant of Washington University opened the 1949 Summer Speech Conference at the University of Missouri, speaking on Burke, Barre, and their Audiences on June 15 and Aspects of the Rhetorical Tradition on June 16. H. C. Harshbarger of the State University of Iowa continued the series on June 27 and 28, speaking on Radio and Television and the Teaching of Speech, and Radio and Television in the Modern World. Dean James H. McBurney of Northwestern University concluded the series, speaking July 11 on Discussion and Social Action, and July 12 on The Leadership of Discussion.

FOUR OHIO SPEECH ORGANIZATIONS held their Second Annual Conference for Speech Education in October at the Deshler-Wallick Hotel in Columbus, where they studied speech teaching problems ranging from elementary school level to the graduate school. Eleven conference sessions were held, including two therapy meetings devoted to esophageal speech. Sponsoring groups were the Ohio Association of Speech and Hearing Therapists, Ohio Association of Secondary Teachers of Speech, Ohio Association of College Teachers of Speech, and the Ohio High School Speech League.

SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST SPEECH CONFERENCE: Chairmen of Departments of Speech and other speech teachers from ten Seventh-day Adventist colleges in North America and the Theological Seminary held a nine-day study-conference in Washington, D. C., in August, in connection with a quadrennial conclave of heads of departments of English, education, and language of these church-related colleges. Charles E. Weniger, dean of the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, was chairman of the speech conference; Wilfred F. Tarr, Washington Missionary College; and Winton Beaven, Union College, Lincoln, Nebraska, were co-secretaries. An inter-college publication was inaugurated.

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA SECTION OF THE WESTERN SPEECH ASSOCIATION: The spring meeting was held at Occidental in May with the following slate of new officers elected: president, Herold Lillywhite of Whittier; vice-president, William Parker of Redlands; secretary-treasurer, Jane Fadler, Los Angeles City College. An executive committee has since been appointed, including Paul Smith of Pasadena City College, Milton Dickens of the University of Southern California, Martin Anderson of the University of California at Los Angeles, Upton Palmer of Santa Barbara, and John Ackley of San Diego State College.

PERSONAL NOTES

AT ALABAMA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE: Joseph H. Mahaffey was awarded one of six grants-in-aid to conduct further research on The Speaking of Carl Schurz.

John C. Green attended the University of Southern California during the summer session.

Mary Louise Gehring was visiting professor of speech at Baylor University, Waco, Texas, for the summer.

E. K. Jerome, director of the speech clinic, addressed the State Vocational Rehabilitation Conference in July.

AT DENISON UNIVERSITY: Lionel Crocker has been elected editor of the *Central States Journal of Speech*. It is planned to bring out two issues each year. Mr. Crocker was on the staff of the University of Maine during the summer session.

AT THE UNIVERSITY OF DENVER: Elwood Murray, director of the School of Speech, was a resource leader in general semantics at the third National Training Laboratory on Group Development held at Bethel, Maine, in June and July.

Gilbert Rau, formerly instructor of speech at Wayne University, completed his doctorate in education at the University of Denver this summer, and has been appointed chairman of the Department of Speech, Central Missouri State Teachers College in Warrensburg, Missouri.

Edward Palzer will receive his doctorate in speech from the University of Denver in December, and will take over his new duties as chairman of the Department of Speech, The Stout Institute, Menomonie, Wisconsin.

James Shanks received the master's degree this summer from the University of Denver, and is now teaching speech and speech correction at Iowa State Teachers College in Cedar Falls, Iowa.

Carl Isaacson received the master's degree in speech and radio at Denver University, and has been appointed director of radio and forensics, Idaho State College, Pocatello, Idaho.

Celestine Evans received the master's degree at Denver this summer and is now teaching speech and forensics at Boone Junior College, Boone, Iowa.

Patricia Belcher Davis received the master's degree from the University of Denver in oral interpretation, and has been appointed fellow in the basic communications program.

Ruth Browne of Kansas City, Missouri, received the master's degree this summer and is now teaching speech in the high schools of Kansas City.

Bruce Graham received the master's degree in speech correction at Denver this summer, and is now studying toward the doctorate in the same area at Northwestern University.

AT THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS: Visiting members of the speech staff during the summer were John P. Leland, director of theatre at Knox College; Paul Moore, School of Speech, Northwestern University; and William P. Halstead, Department of Speech, University of Michigan. Guest lecturers were Herbert A. Wichelns, Cornell University, and Virginia Lee Comer, of New York City.

Charles Shattuck has returned to the directorial staff of the Illini Theatre Guild. During the past year he was director of the Vassar Experimental Theatre.

Joseph W. Scott, technical director of the Illini Theatre Guild, University of Illinois, was granted the doctorate from Ohio State University in June. He resumed his duties at the University of Illinois in September, with the rank of assistant professor.

Lucilla Hall, member of the Illini Theatre Guild directing staff, spent the summer in Europe visiting the leading theatres.

JoAnn Perring and Mary Homrighaus, former members of the theatre staff at the University of Illinois, have accepted positions as recreation directors with the U. S. Army and are at present in Germany.

AT INDIANA UNIVERSITY: Lee Norvelle, chairman of the Speech Department and director of the university theatre was invited by the Mutual Broadcasting Company to appear on their program 'Luncheon at Sardi's' in August. He discussed the work of the university theatre, the NTC Touring Company, and the Brown County Playhouse summer stock company.

AT LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY: Carroll Ellis, who has been teaching at Louisiana State, has joined the faculty at David Lipscomb College, Nashville, Tennessee.

Charles Mudd, who has been studying at Louisiana State University, has accepted a position at St. Louis University.

Ralph Robb, who served as director of debate for a number of years at Northwestern Louisiana State College, Natchitoches, Louisiana, has been appointed acting president at Louisiana Polytechnic Institute at Ruston, Louisiana.

On June 23, Loren D. Reid, head of the Department of Speech at the University of Missouri and secretary of the SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, addressed the faculty and graduate students of the Department of Speech, Louisiana State University, on the subject of the British Parliament.

AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND: The Department of Speech and Dramatic Art has sent two instructors in speech to the American Occupied Zone of Germany to teach courses in public speaking: W. L. Strausbaugh and L. V. Mayer who flew to Germany on October first to take over the work. Eight-week sessions will be taught in Berlin, Frankfurt, Wiesbaden, Heidelberg, Munich, and Nurenburg. The entire program covers one year, and the instructors will rotate from center to center. The speech offerings are part of an over-all education program which the university has established for the occupation troops and civilian personnel.